

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 44 the Speaker had appointed Mr. CARLEY and Mr. GIFFORD tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral vote on February 8, 1933.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13607) to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) providing for a joint session of the two Houses for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late President Calvin Coolidge.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the company for the year 1932, the results of the operations of the company for the month of December being estimated only, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections to the House of Representatives, in which it originated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LONG. For a question.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LONG. No; I do not yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. I yield for a question to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask the Senator if he will not yield to me to deliver the address which I announced I would deliver at this time?

Mr. LONG. I can not at this time do it. I think if the Senator will withhold his remarks on the birth of the eighteenth amendment, by the end of the week he can deliver a eulogy on its death at the same time. That will save time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I differ in that respect with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if I may propose a unanimous-consent agreement that it shall not take him from the floor if I get permission to go ahead for 20 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Yes; I should be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes without the floor being taken from the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have no objection if I shall be allowed to have 30 minutes with the same understanding.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection to granting both requests. The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that manner of parceling out the time of the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana had the floor when I moved a recess on Saturday and has been recognized this morning. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] gave notice a few days ago that at this time he would address the Senate on a certain subject, which announcement usually carries with it the understanding that all should give way to him for that purpose. I do not know how the Senator feels about that this morning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas rose.

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LONG. Just a minute. I have not yielded the floor. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senate can not reach an agreement to vote on the Philippine veto to-morrow morning immediately after the Senate convenes.

Mr. LONG. Several Senators have told me they want the subject discussed. The Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] wishes to speak on the Philippine veto. Several others wish to speak on it. I hope the Senate will not interfere with their wishes. I may be immodest in making this statement, but one of the Senators on this side of the Chamber came to me this morning and told me he had serious doubt as to what his vote is going to be on the veto, and asked me to cover the question thoroughly in so far as it affects the agricultural interests of the South. I can not agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas, and I do not think the Senator from California would agree to a gag rule here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. O Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I do not yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that the Senator from Arkansas did not suggest a gag rule, and it is hardly fair to impute to him such language.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I merely wish the indulgence of the Senate to say that I am not asking any gag rule. Everyone here realizes that there are only two ways in which a vote can be reached when there is a filibuster in progress. One is by agreement and the other is by cloture. I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, upon the convening of the Senate, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the Philippine-independence veto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana objects. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE rose.

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My question is, Will the Senator yield to me to enable me more or less briefly to express my views concerning the matter immediately before us—the Philippine subject?

Mr. LONG. I am willing to yield provided by unanimous consent it does not take the floor away from me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has already been made to a similar request.

Mr. LONG. I am ready to proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to say that those of us who are trying to discuss the Philippine question are not so proud of being charged with filibustering. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] took a couple of hours on Saturday discussing the bill and I think that he—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I did no such thing. I spoke about 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Then I do not care. I think the RECORD will show the Senator spoke longer than 30 minutes. I will ask

the clerk to get me the time the Senator from Arkansas spoke on Saturday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk does not keep the time. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. However, if I have made a mistake about the matter the RECORD will show just what it was.

I probably should be censured for having taken up several hours when the bill was before the Senate. I proposed, I believe, probably most of the amendments that were adopted when the bill was before the Senate. Naturally the sugar question, with which my State is very vitally concerned, is one of the generally accredited reasons for the freedom of the Philippines.

I hope, Mr. President, if there happens to be some Senator who wishes my views on this matter, that I may proceed without it being considered necessary that whatever I say with regard to any bill at any time, regardless of the interests of my State, must be considered as a filibuster. I have been glad to sit here and listen to the arguments of others who did not stay here and listen to my arguments on this question. They do not care for my opinion. I do care for theirs. I have been in this Chamber practically every minute of the time that these bills have been discussed. I am one of the Senators who sit here and listen to the reasons and to the arguments that are proposed for and against these measures. Then for some Senator who listens to nobody's speech but his own, who does not have to do so if he does not wish to, to get up and tell me, when I have indulged myself to listen to his remarks, that he wants to vote as soon as he gets through with his speech, does not seem to me to be the right thing. We would all like to have something like that done here.

But there is this constant recrimination that "The minute I get through speaking we are ready for a vote." I could have left the Chamber when those Senators were addressing the Senate, but because I have spoken 20 minutes on a bill which has consumed days and months of argument in the Senate, some one or some few who have taken up six hours in discussion conclude it is now time to vote. While I do not like that kind of suggestions, I do say that common courtesy would suggest to those gentlemen, who did not have to sit here and listen to me, that they do not undertake to cut my remarks so short as not to give me the time which I think necessary for discussion of the bill.

It may be that the Senators feel that their logic is so overpowering that the minute they get through that settles the question. But I have heard these Senators speak on measures here when their eloquence did not bring forth the results that I wanted. My people sent me here to represent the State of Louisiana, just as the Senator from Arkansas was sent here to represent the State of Arkansas. I am presumed to know something about the questions affecting my State, whether I do or not. I wish to say that I have been requested to go over the Philippine question, continuing the few remarks I have been permitted to make here.

A short while ago, if the Chair and Members of the Senate recollect, I stated that the agreed view that has been given by the Cabinet members and the President is that this bill will lead us into international complications in the Orient. It is suggested, as I was saying, that there is danger of war by freeing the Philippines, unless we wait 40 years. Four of the distinguished members of our President's Cabinet this morning tell us of the great hazard with which this bill is fraught. I read those statements.

Mr. President, I shall have to ask for order in the Senate before I can proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG. I read those statements. I have given the most careful consideration to every line that has been written on this question. I have read, I think, everything that has been written on both sides of the question. I know of nothing that has been written, no speech that has been made for a period of years up to the present time on the

Philippine question, that I have not read and tried to consider in my limited way.

I read this morning what the four Cabinet members and the President said relative to the veto. Boiled down into one, it is that there is danger of international complications in the Philippines. They do not deny that they have had a plebiscite. If Senators will read what is in the message of the President it will be seen that apparently they have abandoned this great corner stone upon which the President based his veto—of there being no plebiscite.

I believe that to some extent I answered the contention of the plebiscite. I said, and I say now particularly to one or two of the Senators who have asked me to explain the plebiscite this morning, that this bill is no more than a plebiscite. It is a plebiscite. If we undertake to admit a Territory into the Union as a State we do it by plebiscite through an act of Congress. We leave it to the people of the Territory to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of preparing articles under which the people of that Territory are to live as a State. Then that question is submitted to the people in an election, and the people vote on it and decide whether they do or do not wish to enter the American Union as a State under the constitution which is submitted to them. That is a plebiscite.

What have we done in this case? We know that in law when the term "plebiscite," or any other term, is used the definition of that term is taken to be the accredited process followed under that definition at the time; in other words, the law would naturally presume that a plebiscite is going to be such form as is being followed under the law at the time. What is the form? Mr. President, we have proposed here, not to free the Philippine Islands, but that all the people of the Philippine Islands shall meet in a constitutional body, shall draft a constitution along certain lines of liberty and freedom, and shall submit that constitution to the people, after it shall have been approved by the President of the United States as being in conformity with this act of Congress, so that the people at the polls can say whether they wish to live under the flag of America or under their own sovereign flag as a united republic of their own.

If the Filipinos do not want to be freed from America, they will have the double opportunity to say that they do not want to be free. They not only have the right to say they do not want to be free from America at all but they also have the right, as provided in the plebiscite which we are proposing to give them, to say, "We do not want to be free in this way."

The President of the United States and his Cabinet state that there is opposition in the Philippine Islands at this time to the Filipinos being freed in this manner. Well, if such opposition is of sufficient consequence to warrant any attention when this proposition shall be submitted to the Filipino people to vote on, they will have the opportunity of saying whether or not there is opposition. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes] does not think there is any such opposition; neither do I think so. The President of the United States and his Cabinet say there is. All well and good; let the question be submitted to the Filipino people; they will go to the polls, and, if the President of the United States has properly interpreted their sentiment, his judgment will be vindicated in the election; and, if the Senator from Missouri and myself have properly expressed what they believe and want, then our judgment will be vindicated by the election in the Philippine Islands.

But what is the use of arguing around about the matter? When the Republican Party has promised to give the Filipinos that plebiscite and the Democratic Party has promised immediate independence for the Philippine Islands, what is the use of arguing about what the Filipinos are going to do in the election over there, when we will have the proposition submitted at an election and it will be over in a few days, anyway? Why sit here and argue as to whether the Republican Party is going to keep faith with its platform or whether the Democratic Party is going to keep faith with its platform—because, it is said, we do not know what

the Philippine people may do when the plebiscite is submitted to them—when all we have got to do is to carry out our part of the job and let the Filipino people express themselves one way or the other on the question?

I demand order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair) rapped with his gavel.

Mr. LONG. So, Mr. President, I hope that disposes of the plebiscite; I hope I have exposed the fallacy of the idea that, to the remotest extent, there is even a flimsy half-way reason to listen to the President and his Cabinet on the ground that the Filipino people would not want the kind of independence it is proposed to give them. Mr. President, as it is being submitted to them it is the judgment of Congress overwhelmingly that it is the proper way to go about it, and while it is not entirely to my way of liking—and there are many things about this bill that I would rather have written a little differently than they have been written—nevertheless, in order to settle the question we ought to pass on it at this time and override the veto.

I read, Mr. President, from remarks that have been published to-day the significant statement that the only way we can keep out of war in the Orient is to stay in the Orient; that there is danger of our being involved in war if we do not stay there. The most impossible argument is made that if we leave those islands we will be embroiled in war, whereas we will not be if we keep them.

Mr. President, when America frees the Philippine Islands there is no longer any war to be had between the Asiatic races over an Asiatic Monroe doctrine. There is no longer any such thing as an Asiatic Monroe doctrine principle to stir up trouble when we free the Philippines. We will have a treaty with all nations, as this bill provides, pledging neutrality so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned. So how, where, and why can we possibly stir up antagonism when we have given the Philippine people their freedom and have moved out of there, merely helping them to get their house in order and extending them the aid of the American country?

I listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I was unable to understand his logic or his reasoning. I never did understand why he was opposing the freedom of the Filipino people. I do not now understand, as logical and careful and persuasive as he is, and I do not believe many Members of the Senate can understand just why it is that the Senator from Michigan is opposing the freedom of the Philippine people.

I do not understand it for this further reason: I understand from the Senator from Michigan that he is not against the freedom of the Philippines if it can be done in the right way. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Michigan proposed a bill as a substitute for the Hawes-Cutting bill. The only substantial difference was that he was going to have a plebiscite at the end of 20 years, instead of having it now. There was not any other substantial difference between the two bills, except in working out the adjustment of our domestic and international relations. There was practically no other difference, at least none that I saw.

Who is there now who can defend the stand of the Senator from Michigan? Who is there at this time who can say logically that if there is going to be a plebiscite there ought to be a delay of 10 years or 15 years or 20 years? It is ridiculous to talk about waiting that long. It is not the view of the Senate. We fought here over that point, Mr. President, and it was the view of the Senate and the view of the House of Representatives that there ought to be a plebiscite now, and that the period of uncertainty should not be prolonged for the Filipino people, making them like a man tossed from sea to sea with no port of exit and no port of entry.

The book on this question written by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and entitled "Philippine Uncertainty" is, in my opinion, very properly entitled. I had thought I had brought that book to my desk this morning, as I wanted to read a few lines from it, but I do not find

the book here. I have read the book of the Senator from Missouri, and I wish to say—not strictly by way of compliment to the Senator from Missouri—that anyone who has read his book entitled "Philippine Uncertainty" must be impressed with the thorough knowledge and study that have been made of this question by the Senator from Missouri and the careful analysis which he has prepared.

Upon reading it and getting the first-hand information and analysis it contains, more than ever do I reach the conclusion that the only objectionable feature about this bill is not that the time is too short but that the time is too long. We, who have contended for a shorter period of three, four, or five, or six or seven years, might be heard to object to this bill, but it does not lie in the mouth of the President of the United States to object to it on the ground of the time being too short; and that is not his objection. He objects to it because the time is too long.

Those of us who have studied law know that when you mention something that is to be done unless you specify either the future or the past, you are talking about the present. The law presumes that expressions are in terms of the present tense. That is the presumption of the law.

The Republican Party promised a plebiscite, but the Republican Party platform in making that promise did not say a plebiscite 20 years from now; the Republican platform pledged a plebiscite. I think I have the Republican platform here, and from it I wish to read its pronouncement in regard to this matter. I think I marked it, but I have had to lend this book out during the last day or two so much that some of my references may have been lost. However, I will turn to the Republican platform of 1928 and will undertake to locate the plank on this question. If I can not do it rather quickly I will have to wait until another point in my address to quote what the Republican Party said about freeing the Philippine Islands.

I will find it in just a moment. I want to read from the platform on which Mr. Hoover himself was elected.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; for a question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In view of the Senator's discussion of the plebiscite, does the Senator know any reason why the Secretary of War should be the principal adviser of this country on future relations between the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LONG. I have just been trying to express that view, I wish to say to the Senator. In view of the fact that we have provided so carefully for a plebiscite, the idea that we should go out here and get the opinion of the Secretary of War as to whether the Filipino people should or should not be permitted to vote on their own freedom is one of the most farcical things I have ever heard.

Why do we want to call in the Secretary of War, or, for that matter, the Secretary of State, for their advice on what the Filipino people want or think, when we have made careful provision for their passing on that matter themselves? And why should we be speculating, as the Senator suggests, on what the Secretary of War thinks the Filipino people think, when we have a plebiscite here to enable us to find out for ourselves? If he is right about it, he need be giving himself no misery. If the Filipino people do not want independence, that will end the matter.

But turning back to the platform of the Republican Party, Mr. President, it seems that I have lost my marker. I thought I had that part of the platform very handy, but it is very necessary that I read this, and ask my colleagues on the other side of the Chamber to pay particular attention to it, if I can find that particular provision. It is the Republican platform of 1928, on which Mr. Hoover was elected. He was not elected on the last platform, so we can not hold him to that. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that Mr. Hoover could easily say that he was not elected on the last platform, and therefore that does not count; but I want to read the one on which he was elected. When we read the

platform of the Republican Party, we can throw away what the people think about the Democratic Party, which was so amply demonstrated here on the 8th of November, and we can take up the Republican Party's platform on Philippine independence; and I wish to say to the Senators here to-day that the least they could do, under the provisions of the platform of the Republican Party in 1928, would be to pass this bill.

I read this morning from the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. He was quoted in the paper as saying that he thought the veto would be overridden. I do not know whether he was correctly quoted or not; but I was glad to see that statement, because this ought not to be a party matter, Mr. President. Why make this a party matter? Why have any partisanship in this discussion? We might as well try to have a debate over the Declaration of Independence. We might as well try to have a debate as to whether or not we are going to live under the Constitution. This is a question of giving to 13,000,000 people the right, justice, and freedom that have been promised to them and have been demanded not only by the two political parties but by the people of the United States.

Mr. President, do you know what I would be willing to do? I would be willing to extend this plebiscite not only to having it voted on by the people of the Philippine Islands but to having it voted on by the voters of the United States of America.

I believe that I know the sentiments of the people of the United States well enough, and I believe that I know the sentiments of the people of the Philippine Islands well enough, to be justified in predicting that the percentage of the vote in favor of freeing the Philippine Islands would be greater among the voters of the United States of America than it would be among the voters of the Philippine Islands; and I do not mean to say that it would be much less than unanimous among the Filipinos. If, to-day, the American people could be given the right to vote on this veto as to whether or not they wanted to free the Philippine Islands, I do not believe there would be enough votes in a single State in America against giving the Philippines their freedom to wad a shotgun.

But here we have the veto on the ground of war!

Now, Mr. President, I want to discuss that international complication, this supposed-to-be bogey man about a war.

In this celebrated quadruple or quintuple message that we got this morning from the President and several members of the Cabinet, in this celebrated opinion of the gentlemen who are supposed to have made such a study of this question, they say that the reason why we do not have any trouble now with the Philippine Islands being taken by another foreign country is because it would mean war with America. Well, if we had a treaty under which the Philippine Islands were guaranteed their freedom, and they were free, could it not mean war with America just as easily if another power took them as it could now? What is the difference? Yet these smart men are asking the Senate to uphold this veto on the flimsy ground that if America owns the Philippine Islands nobody dares to bother them, whereas if America does not, somebody may.

Why, Mr. President, America's position is forty times as strong if she does not own them. If, after doing what we have done we grant the Philippines their freedom, in the eyes of the world and humanity we are a Nation undertaking to see that the freedom that we gave to those people by taking them from Spain, and then freeing them, is preserved and maintained; that whatever war we wage on behalf of them is a war for human justice, and not a war to retain possession of territory that we have no right to take.

Then, there is another reason. Ever since the time of President Monroe we have been living under the Monroe doctrine. What is the Monroe doctrine? The Monroe doctrine means this, if I may state it: We are all presumed to know it, but judging from the messages that I read in the paper this morning I do not believe that all

others do. The Monroe doctrine is simply the pronouncement of the President of the United States that we will regard it as an act unfriendly to us if any foreign power undertakes any conquest or to take over any territory on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, had America said, when the Monroe doctrine was pronounced, that America would regard it as an unfriendly act if America were kept from taking over those countries herself, it would have meant countless and endless wars.

But America did not say that. America never has had to fortify a boundary line, America never has had to furnish a battleship, over the Monroe doctrine. There never has been a soldier killed in protecting the Monroe doctrine, which has lasted in this country for 100 years. There never has been a soldier killed in protecting the Monroe doctrine, because the Monroe doctrine did not do anything except to say that these countries should have their freedom, and not be held at the mercy and subject to the attack of foreign invaders.

But, Mr. President, we have gone beyond the Monroe Doctrine. We do not have to fortify the boundary of Canada. We do not have to fortify the boundary of Mexico. We do not have to keep any warships and marines in Central America, unless it is done to take some private fruit lands down there that some of our financiers want. Except for that, we never have had to spend a dollar in enforcing the Monroe doctrine. To-day, if America, freeing the Philippine Islands, says to the world, "We want none of the Philippine Islands; we are giving them their freedom because it is the purpose and the spirit of America to give to every people on the face of the earth the kind of a government under which they desire to live and exist and work," if we say that that is the purpose of America, it will never take a battleship, it will never take a soldier, it will never take a pound of lead nor of powder, to enforce the Monroe doctrine extended over the Philippine Islands—that having freed those people and given them their own government, we will not stand for an invader to take it away from them—and a war against America with America freeing those islands will find America the champion of liberty and freedom and the happiness of the world, rather than a country trying to hold and subjugate people under a foreign flag.

So I say, Mr. President, I am astonished that the President of the United States should put this veto on the ground that it might involve us in war, when every experience of humanity since this country was founded points to the fact that there is 10 times the chance of our having no war if we get out of the Philippines, and act in the right way toward those people, that there is if we try to hold them under the Pan American policy which some yet agitate in this land.

Now let me explain the Monroe doctrine. In another terse phrase, it means, "America for Americans." Well, why do not the Asiatics say, "Asia for Asiatics"? We say that this American continent is dedicated to Americans, living under the rule of Americans, wherever they are; but when we get over to the Philippine Islands, we propose a plebiscite to let those people say whether they want to be freed or not, to say whether they want the land of Asia to be ruled by the Asiatics, and then the President of the United States comes in with a veto to prevent the Filipino Asiatic people from themselves having the right to say whether or not they want to govern themselves under the Asiatic customs and laws, contrary to the conception which I have of the commitment of the Republican Party itself.

As I have previously said, this bill is not to my liking in all respects. Some of my good friends operating public journals in this country have seen fit to say that I was subjected to a very peculiar course of conduct in the handling of the Philippine freedom bill in Congress. One feature writer—columnist, I think they call it—says the proponents of the measure yielded in the Senate to the amendments which I proposed and waited until I had to leave the city, then took them out in conference while I was away and passed the bill. Mr. President, while I am

sure the particular writer meant no such reflection, that would indicate that bad faith had been practiced by my colleagues in the Senate in agreeing to amendments while I was here, intending to strike them out when I was away.

I think I should make some reply to that along this line. It is true that I had to be absent on business of this country and of my State. We had conferees who were negotiating on the amendments which I had offered and which the Senate had voted into the bill. One of those amendments I proposed had to do with sugar. We got into quite a controversy here over sugar. The fact of the matter is that it is being charged that we are mercenary in giving the Filipinos their independence, the charge being that we are trying to protect sugar, that it is a trade-off proposition.

Mr. President, I do not want to make any defense in that particular. Everybody knows that I favor tariffs. I do not need to go back and make a long extended speech during the consideration of this Philippine matter regarding the attack which has been made. I do not need to defend my position on tariffs. It looks to me as though there are others who have about worked themselves around to my position.

A resolution was offered in the Senate the other day by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] seeking to find a way to do something to keep foreign goods from coming into the United States. A great move was taken by the Senator from Mississippi, who is looked upon as the one man decrying and objecting to tariffs all the time. Yet he offered a resolution in the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, of which he is an important member, to investigate and determine what we would have to do to keep foreign goods from coming into the United States.

If the Senator is going to find any way to keep foreign goods from coming into the United States except by a tariff, I want to know how he would do it. In one breath the opponents of tariffs have been saying we have to tear down the tariff walls, level them down to the ground, burn up all obstacles to the free flow of international trade, and in the next breath the distinguished Senator from Mississippi himself says that we have to stop foreign goods from coming into the United States, that it has been ruining the country already. If he had been listening to me the last few months, the condition might not be as bad as it is. Now he comes around wanting some of us to tell him how to keep these foreign goods from coming into this country. The only way to do it is to put on a tariff. So I wish to say that there is no need of charging us supposed to be, so-called tariff Senators, with being mercenary because we favor the freedom of the Philippines on this additional ground. I would favor the freedom of the Philippines whether they raised one pound of sugar or not.

One amendment I proposed, and which was adopted, had for its purpose reducing the amount of sugar that might come into the United States free of duty from the Philippine Islands. That was one amendment. The next amendment I offered was for the purpose of reducing the amount of coconut oil coming in free of duty. That amendment was also adopted, on a very close vote.

My amendment relating to coconut oil was stricken out in conference. My amendment relating to sugar was stricken out in conference. But the coconut oil amendment makes the matter a little more general. Every person in the United States to-day producing vegetables from which vegetable oils are made—cottonseed, or any other kind of plant—has to decide to-day whether or not he wants the Philippine Islands to send into the United States, free of duty, coconut oil, a product with which the American farmer can not compete at all. So there is no need of calling ours a mercenary position.

We are face to face with the proposition as to whether or not we are going to let cheap foreign goods come in from a country to which we can not sell goods, or whether or not we are going to protect the American farmer. I, therefore, say that for my part I do not mind for a moment confessing that it makes me a great deal more insistent

upon the independence of the Philippine Islands that these free-trade interchanges between those islands and this country, to the damage of our farmers, may be upset, and the same provisions of law made to apply on trade moving between the United States and the Philippines as between the United States and any other foreign country.

However, getting back to the statement that my tariff amendments were stricken out of the bill, I wish to say, for the conferees, that when I saw that they had cut the time down two years, I figured that my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and my equally distinguished friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] knew that I would have figured that that compensated for taking out any amendment I had offered reducing the quantities.

I was not here to be consulted. They had only their own guess as to what I would have done; and, Mr. President, I believe I was more pleased with the bill as it came back from conference than as it left the Senate, because it reduced the time, and, further, over the period of 10 years it reduced the quantity of imports which might come from the Philippines more than the bill did as it left the Senate, taking the whole 10-year period as the base. So I wish to say on behalf of the conferees that to no extent do I feel that I have been treated with anything but the utmost courtesy and consideration in whatever amendments were agreed to.

Mr. President, if we are going to free the Philippine Islands, when are we going to do it? When are we going to end this talk of freeing the Filipinos? I hold in my hand a book containing the platforms of the two great political parties of the United States, going back as far as 1856 and coming up to the present date, and it will be found from reading these platforms that within a few years from the time when we took over the Philippine Islands either one or both of the parties has stood for their freedom, without interruption.

Frankly, I was disappointed when the Wilson administration expired without our freeing the Philippine Islands. I had hoped that while President Wilson was President of the United States the Philippines would be freed. It would have been better. They would not have built up the big sugar tonnage we find them shipping to this country to-day. They would not have been selling all this coconut oil to the United States. It would have been far better if we had not waited all this time to grant those people their freedom. It has not helped us any, and we have been hurt by keeping them, and we have delayed their chance of building up their country all the more. It would have been better to have freed them.

Now, when we are right on the threshold of giving them their independence, the President of the United States and his Cabinet have burned the midnight oil to find a means of persuading Senators to vote to sustain the President's veto. If I had been President, and if my veto had been overruled over in the House of Representatives, even Republican, as it almost is, by a vote of 3 to 1, I would not have opened my mouth; I would never have endeavored to impose my views to such an extent on the Senate, which has practically the same division along party lines. It is futile.

The President has held the bill on his desk for about 10 or 12 days, and it has been here now 2 or 3 days longer. I know the President has had at least 10 or 12 days—and the last couple of days—to impress his views upon the Members of the Senate; and I am asking the same Senators who, for practically two weeks, have been under the persuasive power of the Cabinet and the President of the United States, who have listened to them for weeks, to listen, if they can, to the reasons we will give to them, in far less time than it took the President to give his reasons on this question.

Mr. President, this important question, on which men like myself have been working ever since we have been 21 years of age, should not be lightly considered. I am no new convert to this or any other of these causes of liberty and justice. I have been for the freedom of the Philippine

Islands ever since I have had sufficient understanding of public affairs to make an expression on the subject. And now, when somebody becomes converted to the cause, or somebody who has been converted all along decides to speak on the cause, I hope it will not be considered immodest in me to state my views. I do not believe in our opponents taking the full time and running everybody else out, and thinking they are the only ones who understand this question. In my feeble way I am asking Senators to give consideration to the arguments which I make.

I have followed this question since I have been in this body. I have stayed here and listened to the arguments which have been made. I may not have voted with all the Senators here, I may not have voted with all of them—I could not do that—but if any man here desired to impress his views on other Senators, I have remained in the Chamber, whenever it was possible for me to do so, listening to the arguments he had to make. Yet when we come to a bill like this Glass banking bill and this Philippine bill and have tried to get the party leaders to listen to us, they have been off in the cloakrooms circulating petitions for cloture, and will not stay in the Chamber to listen to a word we say. They have shut the people out without a hearing. That is the trouble here now. The very men who are most urgent in seeking cloture are the men who will not listen to anybody express his views except themselves.

I wonder if they think we are just taking up time. I do not mean to reflect on them. They have the right to stay away if they do not want to listen. But if they do not want to listen, they ought not to come out of the cloakroom and seek to stop argument, after they have been heard ad libitum on these questions, and have refused to listen to anyone else.

My friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] delivered a speech here the other day that analyzed the currency question from top to bottom, from one side to the other, which gave the statistics and data so completely that I do not see how any reasonable man could have sat and listened to them without having been impressed almost to immediate action. Yet the distinguished leaders of the party, with one or two exceptions, were not even in the Chamber among us other Senators when we were trying to get the facts heard. How many have been here when we have discussed the question of giving something to eat to the people in the Philippine Islands and in America? How many have been here when we have discussed these little old insignificant questions about giving the people some work to do, some clothes to wear, some houses in which they might live?

We can not get those Senators here to listen. That is why we are handicapped to-day, because the President of the United States has a means of reaching Senators. His expressions are read in the morning papers. Every word the President says goes on the front page of every paper in the world. Every word the Cabinet says goes on the front page of every paper in the world. The only way we can get our views over to Senators is to try to get them to listen to us here, or else read our addresses in the RECORD the next morning.

I am not pleading for Senators to vote with me. I am pleading with Senators to listen to the arguments that are being made in the Senate, instead of coming in here when they have not listened to anybody and wanting everybody else to listen to them. My understanding is that such Senators as those from Oklahoma, Montana, North Carolina, Texas, Louisiana, and other States are each of us one ninety-sixth part of the Senate, sent here by our people. The Philippine bill brings out the point that we are solicitous not for the Philippine people alone but while we are talking Philippine independence, why can not some lusty soul be heard to make a plea on behalf of the people of America, whose condition to-day is far worse than that of the people of the Philippine Islands?

Half the people of America to-day are only partially supplied with food and clothing which they need and homes in which they may live, but hasty action is urged for the Philippine Islands, perhaps taking the chance of losing the

whole bill, and yet we can not get consideration at all for the American people. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, told us that 50 per cent of the American people to-day are on the charity of the world, yet we can not get any consideration for them. Mr. President, I say it is a sad commentary.

I was impressed, Mr. President, with one thing in the book of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] that is so long that I am not going to read it, but I am going to state its substance. I was impressed that the Philippine people are a people as capable of organization as the American people themselves. The one thing that impressed me most about this book was the description by the Senator from Missouri of the little band of Filipino children who were making a march, never stopping, keeping step to music, spelling out the word "independence," making an "i" and then an "n," then a "d," and spelling out the word "independence," moving with alacrity and precision equal to that known in any army. It is the only unanimous community of a great body of people providing the hope that the great principle that started this country off as a democratic Government would be the means of achieving their own independence, having carried that sentiment so far that it was imbedded even in the minds of the children in the schools.

I doubt, Mr. President, I doubt very much, that children of that size and age in America understand the problem of their own independence as well as the children of the Philippine Islands do. Talk about how capable the Philippine children are and the Filipino people. I say, gentlemen of the Senate, that I doubt that the children of America and the people of America understand the problems affecting their own independence as well as the Filipinos understand theirs. That is a broad statement to make. That will be considered a revolutionary statement, but in a few words I am going to prove it. I am going to state it again. This country, founded upon the corner stone of liberty and freedom, Mr. President, holding the Philippine Islands as we do to-day—I say, gentlemen of the Senate, that we do not understand in America the question of our own independence as well as the Philippine Islands understand the question of their independence. Now, let me prove it, and I shall prove it so clearly that the man without ears can hear and without eyes can see it. I will prove to you that we do not understand the problem of our own independence anything like as well as the Philippine people understand theirs.

Does anyone mean to tell me we are free people in America? I wonder if anybody will say that? I want to know, before I go farther, if I shock the sensibilities of Senators, if there is anyone here who will say there is any such thing as a free American people to-day. If there is, I want to hear from him. I want to hear the Senator who will say that there is such a thing as a free American people to-day. What is freedom? It is the right to live in reasonable comfort. Mr. President, to show that the Filipinos are more learned in this line than we are, in defense of the knowledge and capacity of the Philippine Islands and for that purpose alone do I make this illustration, although it may to some extent affect other questions before the Senate that we have been discussing.

Here in America we have too much to eat and yet people are starving to death. Is there such a condition as that prevailing in the Philippine Islands? I pause for some one to question me on that matter.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. LOGAN. I believe about 2,400 years ago Heraclitus, the ancient philosopher, said that the man who depended on his eyes and ears for witnesses was depending upon witnesses that were very unsatisfactory. Does the Senator agree to that statement?

Mr. LONG. Yes. I think we should depend upon our hearts, and I want to call upon the hearts of American financiers to-day, because 5 per cent of them own 85 per

cent of the wealth and we have 60,000,000 people starving because we have too much to eat.

I agree with the Senator. That is the trouble. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. The man who depends on eyes and ears alone is in a bad way. But where is the heart and the controlling voice of the country to-day? That heart is now like Samson's that can see only power and aggrandizement, which feels itself stronger, which puts one arm around one column of the temple of the Government and another arm around the other and stands there, and because it is so powerful it pulls down the temple, destroying the American people, but destroying itself in the collapse.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Again referring to Heraclitus, I would call the Senator's attention to the fact that he said it is hard to contend against the heart if it is ready to sell the soul to purchase its own desires.

Mr. LONG. The Senator did not have to go to Heraclitus to find that. The Bible says that in better words:

Wherever your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

That puts it better, and we all know what it means. [Laughter.] The Senator will find it all written in the Bible. It is all there. He can read all the lines of Shakespeare he wants to, but for every elegant line from Shakespeare I will show where he got it out of the Bible.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I yield further to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. The Bible also says to "make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," does it not?

Mr. LONG. I am making a friend of the mammon of unrighteousness. That may be said. I will have to say that the Senator is a little bit better posted on that particular passage than I am. [Laughter.] I believe, however, I have made some friends among that class. I have some friends among them. They are better friends to me than some of the men voting with them in the Senate to-day. They have bought me more feed than most of the men who are here to-day. I eat with them. They are my personal associates. I do not offer the suggestion to Senators that they can do likewise and become profit makers out of this transaction, but I am simply saying that I have tried to cultivate these friendships myself to know the other side and my side.

In order to answer the question of the Senator from Kentucky, and I must confess that in Greek philosophy and ancient and modern history I am at a serious loss in undertaking to controvert any matter that is brought up by the Senator from Kentucky, but in order to give my explanation of it, no country can run that does not realize that the American and the human race is one; in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we are a part of each other. The great trouble with America to-day, and the Philippine question illustrates it thoroughly, is, as I was about to say when I was interrupted by the Senator from Kentucky, that we have control over the Philippine Islands and that we are trying to say that we are more competent to govern the Filipinos than they are to govern themselves. We claim—and I defy anyone to contradict what I say, and no one here is going to do it—that we are so capable, so righteous, so educated that we are the ones who should govern the Philippine people instead of them governing themselves.

Yet, with more stuff to eat in America—and I want the Senator from Colorado to remember this—than we can eat up in two years and a half without raising another bean or sack of oats or pot of greens, with more to eat right now in America than we can eat up in 30 months if we do not raise another thing, with more to eat than we can eat up if we never fatten another shoat, those in charge of this Government tell us that we ought to be the ones to govern the Philippine Islands, when with three times too much to eat we have got 60,000,000 people starving to death that we ourselves are having to feed.

You will never, Mr. President, get me to say that we are more competent to govern the Filipinos than they are to govern themselves. I call on anyone to say that there is such a condition prevailing in the Philippine Islands, or Russia, or anywhere else, where, with three times too much to eat, half the people are depending on charity to keep from freezing to death and starving to death, and still some of them are starving and freezing in this country.

Senators, have we not proved the case? Boys and girls and men and women of this country are going to bed hungry at night, going to bed in misery and awakening in a state of semiparalysis; there are children, Mr. President, whose mothers, in order to keep them warm, when they have not a place to put above their heads, are digging holes in the ground in order to keep them warm—starting their lives in the grave instead of in the cradle. Yet we hear talk that we are so wonderfully competent that we ought to keep the Philippine Islands because we are the keepers of America.

I should say, Mr. President, that the United States Senate would be a fair test to prove American civilization; it represents at least, I should take it, the average intellect of the country. I would not say it is above it [laughter], but I would say it is a fair average test of American understanding and intellect. What have we done that should cause us to compare ourselves to the Filipinos? The Filipinos have concerned themselves with the freedom of their people; they have concerned themselves with liberating their 13,000,000 mouths and minds and hearts from the control of any government except their own and from the rule of even a domestic tyrant.

What have we done? The United States Senate, we are told, is deadlocked because the financial powers have determined that the only legislation they are going to let us have is a bill concentrating the control of money in this country in the hands of four or five men. Yet we undertake to say that our civilization is above the civilization of the Filipinos, when the United States Senate has been held here for such a purpose, with the mouths of the people open crying for food, crying for clothing, in a land with too much to eat, in a land with too much to wear, in a land with too many houses in which to live. Yet the United States Senate is not considering, and is not going to consider, nor is it concerned, with any bill to inflate the currency and to put money in the pockets of these people. No. It is only concerned in seeing that before the eventual day shall arrive what chance of wealth and life there is left, if there is much left, shall be concentrated under the domain of the piratical financiers who have concentrated practically everything into their hands already, and the hurry rule has been invoked on the question of taking over the balance of it. There is not a bill here, there is not a request to act on a bill, there is not a single party leader requesting the passage of a bill here to-day to feed the American people—not one of them.

But we will be kept in session at night; Senators will be arrested and brought back here; they will even put cloture and gag rule on if the financial powers say so. And that in a country with too much to eat and with children beginning their lives in the grave instead of in the cradle. Yet they talk about our civilization being so much above that of the Philippine people that we ought to try to go 8,000 miles away and govern the Filipino people because we are more civilized than they are.

Mr. President, what is civilization? Let somebody tell me what civilization means. I do not know what it means. Does it mean a development of the mind and the heart to such a state that production is so multiplied that in the shadow of too much there is misery, starvation, and death? That is civilization à la America. It means when scientists perfect a new kind of process or invention whereby one man can produce what two have previously produced, that, instead of there being ease and luxury by reason of God's disclosures to man, there shall be misery and starvation of mankind. It means, Mr. President, that when the Lord of Sabaoth smiles on the land so that the fields shall yield in full everything that mankind can desire or appreciate, when

the Lord has been so bountiful with rains and seasons as to cause the fields to yield in abundance and provide for humanity all that heart and mind may require, because the lands have yielded so plentifully, the people have got to suffer starvation.

That is the civilization we are talking about putting over on the Philippine people.

So I say, Mr. President, proud as I am, with all its faults, that I am an American citizen, that before we begin to try to set ourselves up as the standard of government, we should take stock of our own house and see just how we fare.

I want to tell you, Mr. President, I am fighting for the Filipino people because I do not want them to be under what we are under. I want to get them out from under this nefarious condition. Then they will have a chance to save their lives. I do not know whether we are going to save ours or not, but I am a good enough citizen not to want to see the Philippine people become enmeshed in the net of Wall Street before they become free. I want to see that they are free while they have a chance. I do not want us to hold them until high finance shall have gotten the stranglehold on them that it has on 120,000,000 people in America.

I do not want to hold these people until they are in a condition where, with too much to eat, half of them are starving to death; I do not want to hold them until they are in such condition where with so many clothes that they could not be worn out in four years and half the people have not anything to put on; I do not want to hold them until they get into such a condition that, with so many homes that the building and loan associations can neither rent nor sell because no one has the money with which to buy or pay for them, they are walking the streets; I do not want to hold them until they can be Americanized to the extent that even in a land of too much there is misery, despite all the blessings of the Lord. Do not let us Americanize them and leave them to settle down where they can never live, but let us give them relief from the condition we are under to-day. Let us save them while they can be saved; let them run for their lives. We may not be able to save ourselves, but God save the Filipino people.

Let us be human beings, as the Senator from Kentucky said; let us be ruled by the heart. If we can not save ourselves, let the Filipino people save themselves. Do not put them under the kind of condition under which we suffer.

Mr. President, I think we are going to work out perhaps; I think perhaps America will come out; I do not know how.

I want to confine my remarks solely to this question; I do not want to deviate even to the most collateral extent; I want to stay on this issue; and if I leave it, even to the slightest degree, I want my attention to be called to that fact. I want to discuss nothing but this one great subject. It brings up many arguments. Mr. President, I may be immodest, but I believe I am answering these arguments on this bill.

We have heard it remarked about Americanizing the Philippines. Mr. President, you can not Americanize the Filipinos. They are not our kind of people; they are Asiatics. They live in a different climate; they do not need shoes such as we wear; they do not need stockings such as we wear; they do not need all the clothes we wear in this country; they live in a different climate. They are just as well off and better off barefooted than we are with shoes on; they do not need them. They are more comfortable; they are more healthy without them, up to a great age, maybe, a pretty old age, and the worst thing they could do in a climate such as they have would be to try to accommodate themselves to all the apparel and mannerisms of the American people.

I do not know whether they eat like we do. I do not think they use knives and forks, some of them do not; but that does not make much difference, if they get something to eat. We are perhaps adopting as many of their customs as they are adopting of ours.

Mr. President, for 45 or 50 years this capital city used to laugh over the fact that in the backwoods people drank their

soup out of a soup plate. Yet we fooled around until we ourselves put handles on soup plates, so that we could drink soup. [Laughter.] After thinking that all these things were so contrary to good manners, people have come to find out that the main thing is to have something to eat—what you need to eat—the main thing is to have something to wear—what you need to wear—and a house to live in where you can worship God according to the dictates of your own conscience and enjoy a reasonable share of the conveniences and even of the luxuries which the country can supply in abundance. That is what the people need; that is all they need. I do not care whether or not they are taught to make the fancy salads that are served on American tables. One does not know what is in them half the time. If they want an egg, let them try it and eat it, if that is the way they want it. What do we care about their learning American manners and standards of living? If they have got plenty to eat and plenty to wear and homes in which to live in comfort, and have sanitation, health, sunlight, water, weekly or monthly or otherwise, that is their business. Mr. President, if we are going to hold the Philippines until we have educated everyone of them to live and act like an American, if what we are trying to do is to Americanize them, it is ridiculous, absurd, preposterous.

It is illogical for one to talk about "Americanizing" the Filipinos and teaching them the American customs and standards of living. Let those people live as they want to live. They have had their schools started off. If they want to live in a certain way, that is their own business. But, at that, the Filipino has it on us. He may not have the silver knife and silver fork; he may not have the plate to eat from, with his ancestors' pictures in the middle of it; but he has something to eat. He may not have on his table a crocheted tablecloth with the pictures of the various mariners in the center and the family tree in the corners, but he has the grub to put in his mouth. That is what he wants.

They need what we need. They have what we have not. We had better get down and say to them that we are interested in the fundamentals of living; that we are more interested in victuals for the table than in the table itself. That is what we are concerned about.

We do not want to Americanize the Filipinos. Why not Americanize the Chinese if we are going into that sort of business? There are about 400,000,000 of them over there that we can work on. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Why do we want to try to Americanize the Filipinos? I understand that in this investigation that was made over in the Philippine Islands one of our imported investigators was more impressed and excited and abashed by the fact that some of them were eating with chopsticks than he was with anything else. The first comment I noticed that appeared in the press from that gentleman was that he had had a terrible lot of trouble eating with chopsticks over in the Philippine Islands. Why, if I had been sending him over there I would have given him a spoon before he left. [Laughter in the galleries.] He did not know as much about the Filipinos as they knew about us. Why did he not prepare himself if he was going to have trouble when he went over to the Philippine Islands to investigate them?

Getting back to the subject, Mr. President—for I do not want to get away from it—I say that with all of these various contentions the Filipinos are better off than we are, at that; that their system beats ours; and I defy successful contradiction on the subject. They may not have the silver vessels, they may not have the chandeliers, they may not have the tête-à-têtes, and the golf links; but the Filipino people have never yet known, and probably never will know unless they get Americanized, what it is to have universal starvation in a land of too much to eat.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether or not he knows that a poll has just

been made of the entire membership of the Senate, and according to that poll—which I believe is accurate—it shows more votes than are needed to pass the Philippine bill over the President's veto?

Mr. LONG. Then it shows that I have done some good. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be no demonstrations in the gallery.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator stated that he was very anxious to help the unemployed and the poor people of the country. That is a commendable thing.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I, too, am anxious to do that. May I ask the Senator if he knows that as soon as opportunity offers I shall offer a resolution, which I have reasonable hope of getting through, which will take \$500,000,000 in taxation off the backs of the American people, if we can get an opportunity to vote upon it?

Mr. LONG. May I ask the Senator how he is going to take off the taxation? What is he going to take it off—income taxes?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I am taking it off the sales taxes.

Mr. LONG. I will vote for that measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I can not do it until I get an opportunity to offer the resolution.

May I ask the Senator still another question?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to have stimulated the Senator to offer his resolution. He has had a long time to offer it, and it has not been offered yet.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has not stimulated me to offer anything. I am able to take care of myself in every respect.

Mr. LONG. I do not yield except for a question—only for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana further yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG. It will have to be a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator if he knows that in the event we could save this much money it was also my intention, in the event that we were to spend it anyhow, to utilize it in some sort of an unemployment-relief campaign, and that talk never will bring the country back to its senses, or make a job, or provide a bit of bread for anybody; it is going to take legislation to do it?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as long as the light "holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return." I am glad that the Senator at this particular time announces that he is one that is imbued, and always has been, with the welfare of all the people. I am glad that the Senator now feels called upon to move for the people, to feed the hungry. I shall have to advise the Senator, however, of the parliamentary status of the Senate at this time, because he probably does not understand it. The parliamentary status now is that when we dispose of this bill we come back to the Glass banking bill. If the Senator can get consent to sidetrack the Glass banking bill, I will go with him for his measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may not know it, but under the rules of the Senate it is in order to take from the table at any time a resolution which is pending; so, if we dispose of the Philippine independence bill, may I ask the Senator if he does not know that it would then be in order to consider the resolution which I have on the desk pending?

Mr. LONG. May I ask the Senator in that connection—yielding to him only for a question, of course—whether he has secured the consent of the proper parties to put the Glass bill out of the way and take up his resolution? If so, he can come back and see me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield for another question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator must know that there can be no program for the rehabilitation of this country, or for the help of the unemployed, or for the downtrodden farmers, or for anything else, until we get a chance to legislate.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I shall be an educated man, if the Senator continues to inform me. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. President, I want now to make the statement, before I go further in discussing this bill, that we took a poll before I started my speech the other day, and the author of the bill then figured that he was four votes shy. I do not know what has changed those votes, Mr. President. I only know what has been going on since the poll was taken. Therefore, I do not feel that I have done any harm in discussing the bill. I, however, am unwilling for a single Senator to make this mistake. I want this bill to go out of here not with a closely divided vote. I want this veto overridden to such a point that the powers of the Far East, who think there is nothing to this Government but a Cabinet and a President, will know that in unmistakable terms and by an overwhelming vote the American people, the attitude of the President and the Cabinet notwithstanding, are gladly, from no mercenary or selfish motive or design, granting the Philippines their freedom.

I wish to say—and I hope the Senators from Virginia and from Maryland are listening to me—that if they have arrived at the view that they will sidetrack the chain bank bill, if they have decided that they are willing to let the hand of imperial finance rest where it is for a while rather than to consolidate everything into the hands of these few masters of fortunes and wreckers of nations I am ready to talk turkey. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must announce that if order is not maintained in the galleries the Chair will be obliged to order the galleries cleared.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. For a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he does not know that the Senator from Maryland can not be forced to do anything; that he will listen to reason at any time, but no man beneath the sun can drive him to do anything?

Mr. LONG. I will only undertake to persuade the Senator from Maryland. It is not for my welfare. For myself or any individual I would not try to force the Senator to do anything. For my own welfare I would not humble myself to beg the Senator to do anything. But for 60,000,000 starving people in the land of too much, and 60,000,000 half-naked people in the land of too much, for the children who are beginning life in the grave instead of the cradle, I will humble myself, and, in whatever terms and whatever form the Senator may dictate, I will beg of him action for the American people here to-day. I will beg, I will plead, Mr. President; there is no humiliation that can be imposed upon me so great that I will not follow the form that is prescribed to beg for action here to free the people of America from the misery and the want and the starvation that exist to-day in the land of plenty. Prescribe your formula, how I shall approach it, how I shall pray to you, how I shall beg you, and I will do anything to get the learned Senators here to do something to feed and clothe the American people.

I will do that. There is nothing on earth that I would not sacrifice, even to a seat in this body, if I could get the people of this country fed in the land of too much to eat, and the people of this country clothed in the land of too much to wear, and the people sheltered in the land where we have so many houses that we are having to finance private societies so that they can keep the houses because the owners can not rent them to the people nor sell them to them. The people have to put their children in the ground to keep them warm to-day while we are carrying on

this frenzied financial situation, and trying to combine the balance of it into the hands of a few chain bankers who have wrecked this Nation and every other one they have ever gotten their hands on, and who will wreck the Filipinos if we do not get them from under them.

Mr. President, I have been begging of these gentlemen. I have no pride of accomplishment. It does not make any difference to me how this is brought about, and this is not the first time that this matter has been up. I want to say to the party leaders, if you fear to yield to these pleas I am making because it will be said that I have forced you into line, you can write out whatever thing you want to and I will sign it. The credit shall be yours, and the glory and the blessings of the Almighty that will go with it, and whatever I could say in your behalf. I only want these people fed. We have promised to feed them, Mr. President, and we have not done it. We have not done a thing toward doing it. We have got the Senate in a parliamentary situation where we can not even consider a thing except the proposition here, that imperial finance, instead of disgorging, shall concentrate and suck up what little there is left in this country. That is what we have done.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana, in view of his reference to the situation of the Senate, if his attention has been drawn to the fact that the present predicament of the United States Senate is bringing upon this body the contempt of the Nation and the disrespect of mankind?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I am trying to keep the Senate here. I do not think there will be a Senate here much longer if we allow the chain bank bill to go through. I am trying to save not only the Senate, I am trying to save the American Government and the American people from being chained to a banking syndicate that has already about wrecked us, and will complete the collapse of this country if permitted to go on. I am trying to keep the Senate from having upon its hands not only odium but the blood of mankind, from the destruction that will be in its wake. I am trying to keep Senators from soiling their hands in the blood of people who would perish under this concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.

I want to say, Mr. President, that there is no question about the sentiment of the American people. There are those of us who are standing here with our backs to the wall. Oh, if the people were speaking instead of us, there would be no question about the sentiment the American people would express. But there are only a few of us here standing to keep whatever there is left from being concentrated in the hands of the few before we can get a President in the White House who has promised to decentralize wealth.

The next President of the United States has promised the American people that he will decentralize wealth. But now there is an effort to pass the bank bill before he gets into office, a measure which would close the doors of relief. We have to fight this battle as we are fighting it, and, as I said, we are like Wellington at Waterloo; we have to stand right here and fight until we die, if necessary, to keep this thing from going any farther. There is no such thing as ill motive or fear in the hearts and lives of those of us who are determined that this situation shall not be carried to a point where there will be more than 60,000,000 starving, as there are now.

There is no humiliation you can put on us that will be too great, if we can get you to act for the American people. But there is no pressure under the shining sun or stars in the heavens that can make one of us afraid to champion the rights of the American people here, and stand at Armageddon to battle for the Lord, where we are right now. We are not going any farther back. We will yield to anything you want. Write your terms; write your dictum. Send us into exile after you have done something, if you will perform. But we want these people fed, we want these people clothed,

we want homes for these people, we want to preserve this civilization of ours, created under the spirit of the great Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, with the inalienable right of life, and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We want that spirit to be breathed again in the great 48 States of this Union.

Instead of that, what is offered by those pressing the banking bill? They do not even offer to swap us the devil for a witch. They do not even offer to trade equally with us. As an alternative for this deplorable condition which now exists this is what they say: "Eighty-five per cent of the wealth of the land is in the hands of 5 per cent of the people. Now we offer you one more alternative. We will take over all the banks you have and put them in the hands of the big men, and we will not let you market a Government security unless it is Morgan or Kuhn-Loeb." That is what this bill means. "Inasmuch as the people own 15 per cent of the wealth that we do not own, we will take control of that 15 per cent, and then we will give you a settled status."

They are arguing for a settled status; and what is that settled status? It is the condition of lord and peasant. The other day one of them let the cat out of the bag. He said, "Why not have it lord and peasant? The farming class have had to be peasants in all other countries that have lasted." Oh, yes; they want the status settled. They want to give the pyramid a new base to stand on.

I want to state, Mr. President, that I admire Judas Iscariot. Many a book has been written about Judas Iscariot, who sold his Savior for 30 pieces of silver. But he was man enough to go hang himself after he did that, and I should hope that if I ever betrayed the American people to such an extent that I conceived in my heart an act equal to that of the betrayal by Judas, I would be man enough to hang myself as Judas did. If, in a land of too much to eat, I let 60,000,000 people starve; and in a land of too much to wear, I let 60,000,000 people go without clothes; and in a land of too many homes, I let people roam the streets and the highways and byways, I should hope that if I ever had it in my heart to do that deliberately, I could go to my Maker as Judas did, and be man enough to hang myself. If I could be so low as to do any of those things, however, I am afraid I could not even be that much of a man.

Mr. President, we may be wrong. We do not impugn the motives of other Senators, oh, no. We give them credit for good motives. But somebody is wrong in this matter. Some of us have been wrong a long time. Some of us have failed to act; apparently some do not want to act.

Mr. President, has a more deplorable condition ever been heard of, a more disastrous situation, has one ever been presented, than has been presented in the debate on this Philippine bill, which I am now discussing, and from the argument on which I have been diverted by questions which I hope will not be too numerous in the future? In the discussion of this Philippine question I have merely undertaken to cite an answer to every argument that has been made.

I had reached the point of discussing the question of building up the Philippines along American lines, and according to the standards of American civilization. I think that before we begin to criticize the Filipinos, we ought to take stock of ourselves for a moment. As an example, we are being criticized, as I have previously stated, for our stand on providing protection for the farmer. Are we not all interested in farm relief? Why criticize us because we vote for the Philippine independence bill, when we are all standing for farm relief ourselves? We would not have to be asking for Philippine relief if we had other farm relief. I can point out other forms of farm relief which would make it unnecessary for us to be concerned in the Philippine question. I will tell the Senate what I mean by that. I can cite a method of farm relief which would have avoided this attack made against us on the ground that we are trying to protect the farmers through freeing the Philippine Islands.

We do not need only farm relief. That is not what we need at all. We need a fair deal. I will tell what could

be done that would solve the farm-relief problem, what could be done that would save the labor problem, and the Government's problem. Here, under the lead of the United States Senate, I will take upon myself the responsibility of prescribing within a matter of minutes a program, a panacea, for relief. What I am about to say I am afraid will be read by few, but this is what could easily be done.

We do not need to have our country suffering from a calamity. In 60 days' time America can be made more prosperous than she has ever been in her history, in 60 days. In 60 days there need not be a family without a home, a man without a job, there need not be a single human being starving or without clothes. I will give a program of relief which could be brought about, and the Nation could be started humming in 60 days. But those in authority would have to have a heart in order for me to get it written into the law, and they would have to have the right kind of a heart. I do not mean to say that anyone's heart is dominated by ill motives, but I mean it must be kept attuned to humanity and away from selfishness.

Mr. President, the first thing I would do would be to inventory the farm stocks of the United States—cotton, corn, wheat, oats, sugar, molasses, and everything else. Where it was shown that there was more than a year's supply of any particular crop on hand I would provide that we could not raise any more of that crop next year, not a bit. I will ask Senators not to anticipate me. I will have an answer for what is in their minds as to what we are to do in the meantime. Just wait; I am coming to that. I will cover the case.

I would inventory the stocks. I would never let one hour's work be put to raising more cotton when we have more cotton than we can use up in 18 months anyway. I would never raise another bushel of wheat when we have more wheat on hand than we could use through the next year and then some. Then I would have the Government take over those stocks. What would the farmer do in the meantime? some one asks. I will mention two things, either of which he could do. Either the Government would take over those stocks and hold them next year and give the farmer the difference caused by any rise in price, and let the farmer be idle, or, better than that, I would start a program of public works in every State where the raising of crops was forbidden, so that the people might be gainfully employed in every State in the United States.

I will take upon myself the burden, with my limited knowledge, of showing how we could use every man in some kind of employment, in doing something the country needs to have done, instead of doing something we do not have to have done.

In the Mississippi Valley I would complete the flood program. I would complete the reservoirs in the Middle West. I would complete the harbors on the coast line. Then I would utilize another number of the unemployed in this way: I would use them in industry and on public works. How? I would shorten the hours of labor for the first year, if necessary, to where nobody worked over four hours a day and five days a week, to split that work up among everybody. I would by that means not have a man in America without work. I would have every man in America and every woman and child fed, and I would not be growing another crop to put on top of two more that we can not sell.

What else would I do? I would need money. I have completed the picture except for two things. I would shorten the hours in industry to where production would not exceed consumption. On the farms thereafter I would regulate the production of crops if necessary by a permit system to where production would not exceed consumption. I would then do what? I would need some money for the public works and that is all I need. Where am I going to get the money? I will need \$10,000,000,000. Where will I get the \$10,000,000,000? I will tell you that, too, and I will not hurt a man. I would raise the inheritance taxes to where, when a man dies, all over a few million dollars left to one child will go to the Government, and I will pay out the \$10,000,000,000 that I need in the course of a few

years, and I will never hurt anybody and it will never cost them a cent.

Who will object to that? It is so simple. Who will object to it? Do you say the farmers? They would not do any such thing. The Long plan was gotten up to prevent the raising of cotton in the South, named after me although I was not the man that suggested it. It was suggested to me by Congressman SANDLIN, of Louisiana, and I took up the plan and it was called the Long plan because I took it up in all the States. The credit was not due me at all. It was due to Congressman SANDLIN, of Louisiana.

But the Long plan, so misnamed—it should have been called the Sandlin plan—was approved by the Legislature of Louisiana by a unanimous vote in both houses, 100 men out of 100 in the lower house and 39 men out of 39 men in the upper house.

What was the Long plan? It forbade the planting of a single stalk of cotton in the year 1932. It was said the farmers would not stand for it. In mass meeting after mass meeting in Louisiana they all wanted it, all the merchants and everybody else. We had to get Texas to consent to it or the plan was blown up. Over in Texas they held a mass meeting at which Governor Sterling made a speech in person to 14,000 farmers. I spoke to those same 14,000 farmers through the radio that night. Governor Sterling opposed the Long plan and advocated a 50 per cent reduction. Those farmers of Governor Sterling's own State, notwithstanding his own recommendation, on a vote taken among them that night voted about 13,900 to 80 in favor of the Long plan, and I was not even there to present it. I had more able men, however, who did speak at the meeting, and I spoke to those farmers through the radio.

In Oklahoma the farmers wanted it. In the State of Arkansas the governor told me the farmers were almost unanimously for the Long plan. The South Carolina Legislature met, and the pressure from the farmers was so great that the Long plan was adopted in the Legislature of South Carolina to forbid the planting of another stalk of cotton until they got the surplus off their hands. The farmers of the country were ridden down by men of political ideas who could not see the plan—and they may have been right, let me say—but the farmers wanted to forbid the planting of anything that was not needed in the next year. The farmers, above everybody, to-day would be for the program I have outlined and there would be no trouble to put it over, not a bit in the world.

Now, it is naturally said, Is it constitutional? Can the Federal Government do it constitutionally? I say yes. Why? It can be done under half a dozen articles of the Constitution. It can be done for health. It can be done for the same reason we are trying to exterminate the boll weevil now. A few years ago the Federal Government appropriated several million dollars to exterminate the pink bollworm, and they actually went into the parishes of my State and forbade the planting of a single stalk of cotton until they exterminated the pink bollworm. That was held to be constitutional. All the stronger would this plan be held to be constitutional. It could be done under the taxing power, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] so kindly suggests sotto voce, and it can be done to feed the people of the country, which is a necessary thing for the Government to do, because the first purpose of the Government is to provide for the welfare of its people. But we can not get the proposal considered.

With all of this, one thing further is needed. To make it effective at once, to start relief to the people overnight, we have got to have more money. We could have silver monetized or we could have inflation of currency, but the only thing in the way of a program of that kind is that the big powers of finance are not willing to have only a few million dollars transmitted to their heirs. They want the snowball to go downhill and accumulate more and more and more until the pile of their gold is as big as the circumference of the earth. That is the whole trouble.

That is the plan I have proposed. I have been about 10 minutes presenting a picture that I will stake my political

life will start the wheels moving in America in six weeks. I will walk out of the Halls of Congress and never come back and never ask to come back or do another day's service in public life at all—and I would be glad if it were to come, anyway—if they will adopt that plan and in six weeks America is not humming. I would make it six weeks—I would almost say in three weeks.

Can we get that done? No; we can not get anything like that done. Therefore, do not criticize us when we are trying to protect ourselves by freeing the Philippine Islands. I have stated how we could have avoided the argument that we want freedom for the Philippine Islands in order to help the American farmer by showing what else could be done that certain Senators will not do. I am addressing myself strictly to the subject of freeing the Philippines and I only mention this other matter in order to show why it is necessary that this supposed-to-be mercenary view is taken, which we deny to be mercenary.

My friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] spoke here the other day at some length. I do not know how many Senators heard his speech, but not all of us. I did. I do not know how many Senators read his speech. I not only heard it made, but I read every line of it. I wish it were possible, Mr. President, to get every man in the Senate either to read the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma or to listen to that kind of speeches. The Senator from Oklahoma showed in that masterful address, which he fortified with such statistics and details, notes, telegrams, and letters, that no intelligent man would even contend to the contrary, that the people are using even wooden money in one of the States of the West because they could not get enough actual money to circulate. He showed they were using various and sundry things instead of money.

He showed that in my own State children are paying their tuition in college with bales of cotton. It was the president of the Louisiana State University under me, whom I had the honor to appoint, who threw out the suggestion in Louisiana, and said, "In order that these boys and girls may come to this school we will take their tuition in agricultural products." There has been a whole lot of publicity about Louisiana, but the Louisiana State University, with an enrollment ordinarily of 1,600 students, went up to an enrollment of 5,000 students in hard times because to the best of our ability we took care of our children in that State. The standing of the college went up from third class to first class, as good as Yale or Harvard or any of them, and we have a medical school right in the middle of it that is probably the best in the whole country. We had to realize there was something that had to be done. We have struggled as far as we could with it, and I am thankful to say we have been able to strike down the requirements, also the fees and tuitions, and arranged it so that living costs at college might be lessened, to where we are turning out 5,000 students a year, or something near that, as against 1,600, 1,800, or 1,900 a few years before. But we had to take tuition in agricultural products from many of the boys and girls, and we have had to open up a few little farms around there and put the boys and girls to work on them to raise the products that we are using in the university. We will have almost socialized the institution to keep going if this condition prevails much longer.

The Senator from Oklahoma showed that condition to apply in many other places. He showed they were using everything for money, all kinds of acceptances, notes, printed checks, and every other thing on the face of the earth. Why? They have not money to use for currency.

We may not be able to get our smartest Senators to listen to us. I do not think we can. It is only we dumb-bells who are interested. The Senator from Oklahoma showed that there was \$600,000,000 worth of currency—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did the Senator see a signed article in yesterday's New York Times by Stuart Chase under headlines stating:

Five hundred thousand turn to use of "wooden money." Communities in 29 States are buying goods and services with new medium. It supplants real barter. Movement started in Seattle, where 5,000 people are using the system. Cash value proposed. Stamps affixed periodically would give scrip a solid redemption basis.

Did the Senator see that article?

Mr. LONG. No; I have not seen it. Will the Senator let me have it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will be very glad to do so. [The article was handed to Mr. LONG by a page.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I had no idea this movement had gone as far as it has. I should like to have this article read by the clerk, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the article, and was interrupted by—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I inquire what is being read by the clerk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A newspaper article that was given to the Senator from Louisiana by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SWANSON. How long is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is two columns long.

Mr. SWANSON. How long will it take to read it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it will take about 15 minutes, perhaps.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to say that it is against the rules of the Senate to have the clerk read remarks in the speech of a Senator, and I want to object to any further reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator, the Chair will state that unanimous consent has been given for the reading.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Can a Senator object unless he is in the Chamber to object when these questions come up?

Mr. SWANSON. Not if unanimous consent has been given. In that event, under the rules, it is permitted.

Mr. LONG. Unanimous consent was given.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the article, which appears as Exhibit A at the end of the remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in connection with that article, in fairness to the bankers, let me say that they have given out a counterstatement which is not nearly so long as the article which has been read, and I should like to have the opposite view placed in the RECORD, so that the two sides of the question may be presented. I should like to have the clerk read it.

Mr. BULKLEY. I object to the clerk reading it at the desk.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio objects.

Mr. LONG. I do not think that he will object when he understands the situation. I am only asking, since the other statement, which was about two columns, has been read, that this one, which is less than one column, giving the bankers' side may be read; and I am asking unanimous consent that the bankers' side of the story may be put in the RECORD.

Mr. BULKLEY. I shall not object to the statement's being printed in the RECORD, but I do object to its being read from the desk.

Mr. LONG. I want it read while Senators are here.

Mr. BULKLEY. I object.

Mr. LONG. Then I will ask the clerk to send the article back to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio object?

Mr. BULKLEY. I object.

Mr. LONG. Very well, I will read it myself. I am sorry I will have to do so, for I do not read so well as the clerk. [Laughter in the galleries.]

This article is from the New York Times of January 15, 1933, that is Sunday, January 15, 1933.

Headline No. 1 is:

Bankers oppose scrip for Nation.

The second headline is:

While suitable for localities, its use nationally is seen as threat to dollar.

The third headline is:

Interest in plan grows.

The fourth headline is:

Many communities watch first trials—one project would release a billion.

That ends the headlines. Then I read from the article.

While admitting that the issuance of scrip money as strictly community propositions might be of some benefit—

Notice that. The bankers say that the use of wooden scrip and brass money might be of some benefit. Then says the statement:

Leading banking authorities yesterday frowned on the increasing efforts to adopt the plan nationally as leading to a debasement of sound currency.

Just as the Senator from Oklahoma said, the fact that they will not let us remonetize silver or inflate the currency has led to a nation-wide movement of community wooden and printed money. It will not be gold or silver or aluminum, but will be whatever they want to put out.

I will have to ask for order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG. I read further:

Basing their views on the old economic principle that bad money drives out good money—

Who would not know that? But that is the preface for the next remark—

these authorities predicted chaotic financial conditions would follow any fiat money scheme on a national scope.

Interest in scrip money, particularly the self-liquidating stamped type, increased steadily during 1932, and in the last two weeks the number of proposals for its adoption nationally has multiplied rapidly.

Indorsement of the plan by Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale University, a short time ago gave impetus to the movement, with the result that at the present time several business men and economists, whose knowledge of the intricacies of currency and monetary matters is doubted by banking authorities, have given their approval to the scheme.

Mr. President, that just illustrates the trouble all the way along with the matter. Every time they get up testimony in favor of something of this kind, economists and banking authorities come out and say that such men as Professor Fisher, of Yale, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] do not understand the intricacies of banking enough to understand how to put out money.

SCRIP REVIVED IN GERMANY

Originating in 1890 and more or less dormant since that time until it was revived in Germany and Austria about a year and a half ago, the stamped-scrip idea has bounded rapidly into national prominence, and, following its try-out in Hawarden, Iowa, is now being hailed as a way out of the depression.

Stamped scrip is the outgrowth of various forms of barter plans, of which there are now about 150 in 29 States.

Mr. President, I want to say, while I am proceeding, that I am not going to discontinue my efforts to have the clerk read statements into the RECORD. If any Senator wishes to object to them, of course he has that right; but I do not want to be putting anybody off notice. If some Senator does not want the clerk to read anything here, he had better stay in the Chamber and listen; otherwise, I am going to send these articles up to the clerk and ask unanimous consent to have them read.

Of these, stamped scrip is on the way to being adopted in about 45 communities, which have watched with interest the Hawarden and the Evanston, Ill., experiments.

Briefly, stamped scrip is a certificate, with a certain number of spaces on which a stamp is to be attached each time the certificate changes hands. For instance, on one of \$1 denomination, 52 spaces are provided for the affixing of a 2-cent stamp for each transaction. The stamps, which are bought from the issuing body, which may be a local government or a chamber of commerce—

What do you want in this country? You are going to have chambers of commerce issue scrip; you are going to have the local governments issue scrip; you are going to have 4,000,000 kinds of currency here, as many as you did before you had the national banking act, unless you stop.

For instance, I wonder how many people here ever knew where the term "Dixie" came from. Let me tell you where it came from.

There was a bank in New Orleans by the name, I think, of the Citizens' Bank & Trust Co. In those days each bank put out its own money, and there was a question as to what banks' money was good. This bank specialized in putting out \$10 bills. New Orleans banks have always been among the sound banks of the country, and this New Orleans bank's money was very much sought for. New Orleans being a French community, this \$10 bill got to be referred to by some of the French and some of the English as "dix," "dix-money," which was rather a crude way of calling it a \$10 bill. From that word "dix," the land of that money became known as "the land of Dixie," and the word "Dixie" grew up from the money that was issued by the bank at New Orleans, contrary to what lots of people think.

Lots of people have thought that the term "Dixie" came from the Mason and Dixon line, being probably the first part of the name "Dixon." That was not the case at all. The term "Dixie" grew up and became known, and the old song was written following this, for the reason that I have told you here to-day.

But I am somewhat off the subject. I only meant to read this article and then to hasten along with my remarks.

The stamps, which are bought from the issuing body, which may be a local government or a chamber of commerce, create a redemption fund, so that when the 52 stamps are attached and canceled, the \$1 scrip can be redeemed for that amount—

Not a bad scheme—a pretty good scheme.

the extra 4 cents accruing to the sponsors for printing and other charges.

In the plan now operative, the scrip has had a very limited circulation. In Hawarden, three hundred \$1 certificates were issued to the unemployed for work on public improvements, and acceptance of the scrip was confined to local merchants.

Let me tell you what we did. We put out scrip in Louisiana. We have a scrip going down there and it is big scrip. It is traded in everywhere. We had started our road work. The law had authorized us to sell \$68,000,000 worth of bonds in order to pave the highways of the State.

As governor of the State, I did not want to sell the bonds except as I needed the money to pay off the estimates, because it did not look like good business sense to have \$70,000,000 backed up in the banks; so I kept only about \$10,000,000 ahead, and I would sell these bonds off in \$10,000,000 lots. Lo and behold, the bond market broke after I had sold. I should say, about thirty-five or forty million dollars' worth—sold them at a good premium; sold $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent bonds at a premium, sometimes, on almost as good a basis as Government bonds were sold in the war. All of a sudden, the bond market broke; and we had outstanding at that time road contracts which I had signed as governor amounting to about \$30,000,000.

What were we going to do? We put it up to those people that we had so much money, and we would pay them 30 per cent in cash and 70 per cent in scrip; that is, that the highway commission would issue its scrip, and that whenever the bond market came back we would take it up. But, lo and behold, the bond market did not come back; so we have begun to retire that scrip out of our earnings, to the extent of millions of dollars. Unless the country gets worse off than it is now—and it may—all the millions and millions of dollars of scrip that we issued in Louisiana will be

retired about March of next year out of our normal revenues, if we never are able to sell the bonds.

To-day, Mr. President, the State of Louisiana has millions of dollars of that scrip floating around. It is traded in up to the millions of dollars—so much so that a deal was made of several millions of dollars that was paid off in scrip.

So I just wish to say that there are forms of money going around here that nobody knows anything about, and there are likely to be others. What were we going to do? Were we going to stop the work down there? We did not stop it. We have built bridges over the rivers; we have built paved roads; we have even constructed buildings and things of that kind. We never once thought, when we started out, that we were not going to be able to sell bonds to pay out the project; but we have been going so long that we have been able to catch up with the earnings of our department and will retire the scrip next year even though we sell no bonds.

I read further from this statement:

In Hawarden, three hundred \$1 certificates were issued to the unemployed for work on public improvements, and acceptance of the scrip was confined to local merchants. Since these merchants could not pay for their supplies in scrip, the bulk of it circulated among themselves, although part of it went to the payment of light and gas bills.

Toledo plans a \$500,000 issue of scrip.

That is Toledo, in Ohio, whence comes one of the distinguished sponsors of some of this financial legislation.

The next subhead line is:

DENIED AS FIAT MONEY

Sponsors of the plan claim that its self-redemption feature takes it out of the class of fiat money and that it is a substitute for actual currency backed by gold only in the sense that mortgages, installment buying, and other similar devices are substitutes.

But why not? That is just as good money as any. When we stop to look at it, Mr. President, I do not know but that this is better. Gold is not worth anything except for money. If gold were to be demonetized to-morrow morning, it would not be worth as much as that much wheat, or that much sugar. Suppose we should demonetize gold to-morrow. Gold is not worth anything except just as a fiction to keep up purchasing power and serve as a medium of exchange. It is not worth anything. One of the most useless metals we have in the whole world, intrinsically, is gold; and so, from a practical, usable standpoint, there is not anything back of the currency. In this case, however, they have stuff to eat and everything else behind the scrip, which from the material sense would be a sounder currency than the Government currency if it were not for the fact of the Government's being behind it.

Indicative of the type of scrip plans on a national scale being offered in various quarters, but on a somewhat more ambitious basis than most, is one suggested here last week by J. Briskman, a financing broker. Mr. Briskman would create a private dividend-paying corporation, with the Federal Treasury as trustee, which would issue stamped scrip to the extent of \$100 to every individual over 16 years of age in the United States.

That brings up something that we might as well consider now as later. I have been somewhat diverted by having referred to this fiat-money proposition in the course of my argument on the Philippine question; but, while I am on it, I should like to clear it up, although it is somewhat beside the argument I have been making.

Take the soldier bonus that we had up here last year, in order to illustrate this thing in connection with my general remarks on the Philippine question. We shall have to pay that bonus anyway in 1945, or somewhere along about that time. When 1945 comes we shall have to pay the boys anyway. We might just as well pay the bonus now, and it might yet serve as an ideal medium of remonetizing silver or inflating the currency. I do not know but that it is just as good a way as any unless we paid off the Government debt, because we shall have to pay it in 1945 anyway, and we could be retiring that currency in these 12 years, if we are going to have any money to do it with, out of the earnings.

The scrip in the form of a "mortgage" certificate, issued fortnightly in 10 installments, alternating at \$10 and \$11, would contain 26 spaces for the affixing of a 4-cent stamp for each turnover.

The extra 4 cents for each \$1 would accrue to the corporation to cover financing, printing, and other overhead expenses. To prevent stagnation banks would not accept the script until it was fully redeemable.

I do not know why, Mr. President, I have never understood why, but it is harder to read than it is to talk. I do not know what the connection is, but tests will show that one can talk at length without it hurting his throat at all, but reading has some bad effect. I do not know just what it is, but it is much harder to read than it is to talk. However, I continue to read anyway.

Adoption of such a plan, Mr. Briskman claimed, would immediately start trade and commerce booming, aid the banks through increasing their liquidity, provide more money for taxation by the Government, put an end to hoarding through restoration of business confidence, and divert collected unemployment-relief funds to self-liquidating public works.

Leading banking authorities, however, disclaim any such benefits from a national scrip plan and hold that, on the contrary, it would lead to financial chaos. Bad money always drives out good money, they declared, and the first indications of any national legislation, which would be necessary to legalize scrip, would start a chain of untoward events.

Mr. President, that calls to mind what I read this morning written by Arthur Brisbane. He writes a column for the Hearst papers. Now and then some of the things he says are quite appealing; sometimes they are not. He writes a column which appears on the left-hand side of the Hearst papers, and there are some papers which print it which are not of the Hearst syndicate. Usually he has a little paragraph devoted to one topic, that is separated from the next by a line, and then another subject is taken up. I read his column quite frequently. Of course, it is only the opinion of one man, and being an opinion hastily dealing with so many subjects it naturally has to be taken with a grain of salt, to use an old family expression.

I want to refer to something Mr. Brisbane said this morning which sounds very sensible. He said that we ought to inflate the currency. But he said, of course, having something back of the currency is an important matter. He said, "If you have just currency, paper money, there is no limit to that except the pulp supply of Canada." But he said there was only a certain amount of silver produceable every year, which is not big, and that the safe plan would be to remonetize silver; that that would solve the whole problem.

That would solve the problem, Mr. President. We would not have to worry about getting the Federal Reserve Board not to call it back, we would not have to worry about forgeries and fakes, and we would not have to worry about a thousand and one things. The good thing about it is that we were on the silver basis up to 1873, and I really think that we are just twiddling over nothing.

Brisbane says this, that America would immediately be placed in a trading status with a billion people with whom now we can not trade. I think the total population of the earth is said to be 1,700,000,000, and 1,000,000,000 of the people are on the silver basis.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is the Senator from Louisiana aware of the fact that in the Philippines, a country where the people are not supposed to know enough to govern themselves, they have plenty of money, and now are having no such troubles as we are having from the necessity of using paper and wooden and brass money?

Mr. LONG. Yes; that is one of the reasons why I favor freeing the Filipinos—in order that they may not get into the fix we are in. I fear that if we keep them much longer, they will become Americanized, and have just the same trouble we are suffering. I understand they have plenty of money and plenty to eat and plenty to wear, and I want to save the Filipinos.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I want to thank the Senator from Virginia, who is moving to protect me at this particular time. I take it that the Senator has established a kind of protectorate over the situation. I thank him. I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that under the Constitution only the Congress can coin money and regulate its value?

Mr. LONG. That is what is supposed to be the law.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And under the law the Congress has delegated that power to the Federal Reserve Board. Is it not a fact that the Federal Reserve Board is responsible for the shortage of money throughout the United States?

Mr. LONG. Absolutely.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the reports show that there is something like nine and a half billions of dollars of money printed and ready for use, and that only five and a half billions is in circulation?

Mr. LONG. That is what I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator know any good reason why this excess \$4,000,000,000 should not be placed in circulation to save the people from having to issue this brass and wooden money?

Mr. LONG. There is one reason. The reason is that the financial masses are in control of the currency now in circulation, and they feel that if they allowed any more currency to be put in circulation they would not control the money as they do at present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the enactment of the provisions of the Glass bill would more strongly centralize the control of money in the big banks?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. It would give them a strangle hold, and would take off the board the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, so that if he did not agree with what was being done, he could not do a thing himself. The condition would be worse than ever. They put out their bonds, and take them in. They do not issue the circulation. Why? For the same reason they do not want the dollar to have a bit less value. In other words, they are against commodity prices going up. There is only one way commodity prices can be brought up, and that is by cheapening the dollar. They can not be raised in any other way. Either one of two things must be, either the dollar comes down, or commodity prices remain down, one of the two.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the analysis just given, is it not a fact that in the last analysis the United States Congress is responsible for the conditions which prevail throughout the United States?

Mr. LONG. Yes. I do not see how we can avoid seeing that we are responsible. The trouble to-day is with the action and the inaction of the Congress of the United States, and the President, who has been a working part of it. I include myself in the list. We have failed to do anything; that is the trouble. We have fiddled around here while Rome was burning; and on a 1-string fiddle, at that. [Laughter.]

I read further:

In the first place, the immediate impression would be that the scrip offering was a prelude to abandonment of the gold standard, they said. Foreign countries and investors would immediately start to sell the dollar and American securities.

In other words, the foreign countries would hand us back our own securities. That would be too bad! That would be terrible, that these foreign countries would sell us back the securities we have over there. How many have we over there, I wonder? If we stop them using the Federal reserve

system here to enter on their book currency credits for which they do not even issue currency, they would not last until water got hot with that kind of thing.

Depositors in American banks would withdraw their savings.

That would be terrible.

Investors would sell stocks, mortgages, and other securities backed by gold, and the general result would be the same as that resulting from any other debasement of the national currency.

Very well. The people have to have something to use as a medium of exchange; and if it is seen that this thing is about to wreck the whole financial structure of the Nation, the only thing to do is to remonetize silver or inflate the currency, one or the other.

They are apprehensive about the danger that is coming. How are they going to stop it? Are they proposing that we pass a law forbidding the people to exchange a sack of onions for a sack of beans? Pass a law to keep them from doing that, and see what happens to the law, or see what happens to one who goes out to enforce it. It would be like the time when a revenue agent, up in the mountains, tried to hire a man's boy to show him where the old man's still was. He said he would give the boy a dollar if he would show him where the still was.

The boy said, "Give me the dollar."

The revenue agent said, "Not now; I'll give you the dollar when I get back."

The boy said, "Give me the dollar now, cause you ain't comin' back." [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that they must observe the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I say that apropos of a speech which is to be made by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] on the birth of the eighteenth amendment. I started to say the birth and death. I meant the birth only of the eighteenth amendment. The Senator is going to speak of the birth of the eighteenth amendment, following me.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG. For a question.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator says the distinguished Senator from Texas will speak on the birth of the eighteenth amendment. Is that assumed to be to-day?

Mr. LONG. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from Louisiana observed that the Senator from Texas will speak following the Senator from Louisiana. I make bold to ask, Is that expected to happen to-day?

Mr. LONG. I think he expects to speak to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Senator from Louisiana expect it?

Mr. LONG. I think he expects to speak to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the Senator from Louisiana indicate now whether he expects to make such yielding of the floor as will give to the Senator from Texas the opportunity?

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator expects to speak to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. I will say, in reply to that, in the words of the title of one of Dickens's works, that is Great Expectations.

Mr. LONG. I think he will probably speak. I think the chances are better that he will speak than that he will not. When I yield, of course, I will have to yield the floor, but not to the Senator from Texas.

I will read a little further. I had almost completed this statement, which I wanted the clerk to read.

Such bankers admitted that scrip may be of some benefit as a purely local proposition, but they tabooed it as a national project. They viewed its development as a symptom of the current hysterical demands that "something be done."

These are the financiers. They view the issuance of this wooden money and paper money and stamp money as signs of the public hysteria that something has to be done. That

is what I have told the Senate, something must be done. We can not wait around here, but we must act.

One banker declared that only the sound orthodox plans of action are necessary to start a revival, citing the instance of Germany a few years after the war. At that time, he said, the debasement of German currency had plunged the country into a severe depression, but once the currency was stabilized an immediate upturn developed.

Mr. President, I send this article to the desk and ask that it may be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, why have I gone to this length in this matter? It is to defend the financial system of the Philippine Islands. I am now addressing myself wholly to the matter under discussion. Having shown the conditions prevailing with our own currency, I now wish to show how much better off the Filipinos are in order to show the Senate and the few wavering Senators, who are now opposed to us, just what the situation is. I understand Senators are coming over to our side every few minutes now and that we now have plenty of votes. I was told Saturday that we lacked a few votes of having the necessary two-thirds to override the veto. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has volunteered the information that since I have been speaking, enough votes have been pledged to pass the bill. I do not claim to have helped convert anyone, but I merely refer to the matter as something that has happened since I have been talking on the bill.

I have adverted to this matter of the financial status in order to show that here we are being criticized for letting the Philippines go too soon. For the benefit of those who have come in late, let me say that I have illustrated the mannerisms of the two countries; I have illustrated the forms of government and the living conditions and the various other things in a way to show that we have no right to hesitate to offer the Philippines their freedom on the ground that America offers them anything better than what they have. I have reached the currency question. I have shown the condition of the currency in America and how we have met it. But the Filipino people have all the money they need to do business. They have no stagnation there. They carry on their business. Even with our meddling with them they get along. In spite of us they get along. They must be a marvelous set of people to be hooked up with a people that is paralyzed within its own mainland, and yet the Filipino people are having no practical difficulty with their medium of exchange to-day.

What is the solution? Mr. President, I say to you that if you want to relieve the Filipinos and give them a chance to get to where they can live and be the masters of their own country, do not keep them attached to America. Americanize the Philippines and then free them? I am opposed to it. If we keep the Philippine Islands long enough until they can take 85 per cent of their wealth and put it in the hands of 5 per cent of their people; if we shall keep them long enough until they have produced three times as much of agricultural products as they can possibly consume; if we keep the Filipinos until we Americanize them and Melonize them to the point that in a land with too much to wear they are freezing to death; if we keep them until we have Hooverized them, until they put children in the ground to keep them warm when they are born because they have not enough houses to put them in, and compel them to start life in the grave instead of in the cradle; if we keep them until they have got into a condition of currency like that in which we find ourselves, where there is financial stagnation and the people have not even a medium of exchange with which to carry on the customary and ordinary business—if we keep them that long, we will have practically killed a child before we have given it a chance to breathe.

Free the American people of the Philippines, not only for the sake of the American people. We may not be able to take this strangle hold of the financial masters off our own throats. They may have determined, and they may have such inaction on the part of the Congress that they are

going to keep a masterful hand choking the throats of the American people to the point where we will not be able to save the life of our own Government. But let us not be selfish about it. If we can not save ourselves, let us save the Filipinos before they get in the hands in which we find ourselves. Give them a chance to live even if we have not got the chance ourselves. That is the human view to take of this transaction.

Eighty-five per cent of the wealth of the United States is in the hands of 5 per cent of the people. Eighty-five per cent? I think it is more than that, if anyone wants to know how I actually feel about it. If we take the debts and charge them against the little bit that is in the hands of 95 per cent of the people, I believe that it will be found that 95 per cent of the people have less than 15 per cent of the wealth. I am willing to bet they have not, if that would be legal and proper.

But we can not get any action here. We can get it in the Philippine Islands, yes. Turn them loose while we can. The land of civilization!

Now I come to the part of my address which will compare the civilization of the two countries. I have covered other topics. I now come to that part touching the civilization of the two countries.

Mr. President, it has been shown that the Filipino people are a civilized people, but it is said that there is a possibility, a very remote possibility, that some small remote little corner of the Philippines might revert to the practices of cannibalism. That is to be considered. I want to be fair about this question. I have heard that said, and while, of course, it is only argued that that would affect a small percentage of those people, yet it is a serious question. Therefore, we will have to compare the American with the Filipino on the question of cannibalism. For the benefit of those who do not know what I mean by that statement, I mean by "cannibalism" when a man is hungry and can not get anything else to eat he eats the flesh of another human being; that is, he will eat another human being. That charge is made.

I find that charge to be practically without any foundation at all; in fact, less than none. There is no remote possibility of it. But let us say that there is for the sake of argument, though I do not admit the charge at all; then, what about America? True, it is a terrible thing for a man who is hungry and starving, even for the sake of his own life, to eat the flesh of another human being. That is a terrible thing, gentlemen of the Senate. But how much more terrible is the American cannibalistic system? Here we are with enough money in the hands of the financial masters, some of them with fortunes estimated as high as \$10,000,000,000, that neither they nor their children nor their children's children nor their children's children's children, nor even their children, will ever be able to spend one-tenth of it. Here we are with foodstuffs piled up high and higher. Here we are with wearing apparel far beyond our ability to use. Here are a handful of men who can not eat the food themselves, who can not wear the clothes themselves, who can not live in more than one house at a time; and yet here there are 60,000,000 people starving to death. The few can not eat the food and do not want it and will not use it. We have 60,000,000 people going nearer naked and the few can not wear the clothes themselves. They have houses and palaces—empty houses and palaces for what? We have 60,000,000 people starving and many of them have no place to lay their heads to-night.

Yet we condemn somebody for fear he might become a cannibal and destroy another human being and eat another human being because he is hungry; and yet we have a little handful of political piratical financiers who know no better in their own minds and hearts and consciences than to starve 60,000,000 people to death, just so they can keep the food they can not eat, the clothing they can not wear, the houses they can not occupy; and in a land of too much to eat, people are starving to death. I think the cannibals have the best of the argument.

I have compared this matter on the score of cannibalistic criticism. No, Mr. President, the old story of the dog in

the manger is not in it, where the dog sat on the hay and would not let the ox eat the hay and the dog could not eat the hay himself. As I said on the floor of the Senate, they are like the rich man in the book of old. The great rich man had everything on earth, and he said, "I will tear down my barns and I will build bigger barns and I will fill them to their full and then I will say to myself, 'Soul, take thine ease. Eat, drink, and be merry.' But the Lord said, 'Thou fool. This night shalt thy soul be required of thee.'"

We have those who have given their souls away a thousand times, and the souls of millions more. Senators, I say to you, we have allowed our country to fall into the hands of these cloistered financiers.

EXHIBIT A

The favorite wisecrack of the depression, "What are you going to use for money?" turns out to be no wisecrack at all for at least 500,000 persons in the United States to-day. They are buying goods and services with "wooden money"; money which has no legal backing, no authorization from the Government, but which works.

Failing abrupt recovery, of which no signs are now visible, it is probable that before the year is out millions will be doing business without legal tender. Scores of communities, in 29 States, are using this new and, incidentally, very old method for increasing purchasing power. In Seattle, where the movement seems to have started more than a year ago, 50,000 members, organized into 20 locals, have not only markedly improved their economic position but have formed a political party strong enough to influence the city government.

Another organization, the Natural Development Association of Salt Lake City, has 30,000 members and branches in four States. State-wide clearing houses are forming, and in New York a national organization is being developed. Altogether, there are 144 organizations throughout the country.

The States where this movement is under way in some form are Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

PURCHASING POWER NEEDED

Competent observers agree that whatever the causes of the depression, lack of effective purchasing power by the ultimate consumer is prolonging it, and that no recovery is possible until this purchasing power is available. Day by day it shrinks, and the need for its expansion becomes more bitter. There are three major methods for stimulating purchasing power deliberately:

1. As part of a complete revision of the economic system on the principle of coordinated central planning.
2. By currency inflation, with or without a huge public-works program.
3. By voluntary agreement of local communities and groups to accept the wooden-money substitute.

The first, in my opinion, is the ultimate and best way, but we shall hardly complete the necessary educational course to put it into operation in 1933. The second has been the subject of bitter dispute. The almost universal opposition of bankers and creditors does not presage early adoption. There is a chance, however, that it will be tried in 1933. Wisely guarded and administered, inflation can prove very hopeful; badly designed, it can prove almost fatal.

With planning out for the moment and inflation dubious, the third method would seem the inevitable immediate choice. Half a million people have already chosen it. While Congress argues and captains of industry go into conference, Main Street can get action; get it in 10 days. Exchange groups are springing up almost spontaneously. Idle men want work and food, business men want sales, farmers want to dispose of their crops, professional men to market their services.

FULL COOPERATION NECESSARY

These wants are urgent and cumulatively tremendous. They may be satisfied through barter and scrip exchanges, on one condition—cooperation with the group, playing the economic game with the community rather than alone. This is a hard condition for Americans to meet; but as the depression deepens, more and more are meeting it.

The principle may be stated very simply. Here is a plumber. He has no job, but a splitting toothache. Here is a dentist. He has very few patients and a leak in his bathroom. The plumber says to the dentist: "If you fix my tooth, I will fix your bathroom." The dentist agrees. The plumber has a job to pay for dental work; the dentist has a patient through whom he pays for plumbing. No cash changes hands, but all the prime values of cash have been served. This is barter, pure and simple, the oldest market system in the world.

Now suppose, in addition to the plumber and the dentist, we had a few farmers, a physician, a barber, a truck driver, carpenters, electricians, shoe repairers, laundry workers, tailors, a landlord or two, a restaurant, day laborers, and a central office in which all these people were registered, and which could organize and facilitate exchange of goods and services.

Each member has agreed to forswear profit, sharp trading, and grousing; and to cooperate to the best of his ability. This is the second step, an organized barter exchange. It is virtually impossible for such a group, even if it included a whole city, to provide members with all their basic needs. The immediate purpose is to fill gaps, create employment, put idle plumbers into touch with idle dentists.

PRINTED SCRIP USED

Under this plan, which many communities have put into practice and which some are experimenting with, the central office must do a lot of bookkeeping, coordinating, interviewing, arranging. Straight barter has ever been a clumsy instrument.

We go on then to the third step and introduce a medium of exchange to reduce bookkeeping and facilitate transactions. "Wooden money" usually takes the form of printed scrip, in pads like petty cash tickets, in denominations of 5 cents, 10 cents, up to \$10.

The group pays one another for goods and services in this scrip. It works just as well as regular money, in some ways better, because there is no point in hoarding it, lending it, or charging interest for it, provided the group has unanimously agreed to take it. If some will and some won't and some aren't sure, the plan collapses instantly.

Experience shows that a small group grimly determined to honor this medium of exchange will find the circle widening. Storekeepers come in, taking a part of their weekly turnover in scrip; landlords come in; professional people. In Salt Lake City railroads are taking it, coal mines are bought with it, and banks are clearing it.

Back of the scrip stands not gold or signed paper but real wealth, the labor and the products of the group. Purchasing power is expanded by the scrip, real wealth is expanded by the goods, and services which otherwise would be idle or nonexistent.

The usual method for launching scrip is to have the central office print it and proceed to get it into circulation by:

1. Lending it to unemployed group members of good character in return for their notes, payable in scrip.
2. Buying food with it from group farmers for sale in the exchange store. The farmer pays his help with it, buys other goods from the exchange store, say shirts or furniture; has his hair cut by the group barber.
3. Lending it to business men or tradesmen and taking their note for it, payable in scrip. They use it for paying help, repairs, services, supplies.

STAMPS GIVE COST VALUE

Some scrip is canceled after each full transaction; most scrip plans have a redemption goal in mind. Some have failed through lack of confidence in the steadfastness of this goal. Prof. Irving Fisher is agitating a plan for full cash redemption in one year by affixing a special 2-cent stamp, paid for in real money, on a dollar's worth of scrip, every Wednesday. At the end of a year \$1.04 has been paid and should be in the bank, deposited by the central office which sells the stamps, to redeem the scrip.

A secondary virtue of this plan is rapid circulation—buy something at once and let the next chap put on the stamp. If the stamp is not put on the certificate begins immediately to depreciate. This plan has worked well in certain German communities, and is being tried at Hawarden, Iowa. It does not require registration of members or catalogue of their abilities and productive capacities.

A city government can start it. It requires only acceptance by enough people to make it work. It leans away from the barter group and approaches the status of legal money, a sort of light cavalry brigade, very fast moving, attached to the regular army.

Nakedly stated, to people used to traditional money concepts and traditional economic behavior these plans sound fantastic, absurd, dangerous. They work for half a million people; presently a million, two million. They will not solve the problem of purchasing power in its larger and longer aspects, but they may do much to mitigate the intolerable ravages of the depression, to restore self-respect and tangible comfort. Operating on a national scale, they might even prime the pump to start the economic mechanism moving upward.

If scrip enters into really wide circulation, its effect should be to supplement the purchasing power of legal money, stimulate business, raise prices, and thus quicken the circulation of real money.

However temporary the economic benefits, the movement can not fail to teach two very important lessons: Necessity of cooperation and the fact that wealth does not come out of banks but from human labor, physical and mental.

EXHIBIT B

[From the New York Times of January 15, 1933]

BANKERS OPPOSE SCRIP FOR NATION—WHILE SUITABLE FOR LOCALITIES, ITS USE NATIONALLY IS SEEN AS THREAT TO DOLLARS—INTEREST IN PLAN GROWS—MANY COMMUNITIES WATCH FIRST TRIALS—ONE PROJECT WOULD RELEASE A BILLION

While admitting that the issuance of scrip money as strictly community propositions might be of some benefit, leading banking authorities yesterday frowned on the increasing efforts to adopt the plan nationally, as leading to a debasement of sound currency. Basing their views on the old economic principle that bad money drives out good money, these authorities predicted chaotic financial conditions would follow any fiat-money scheme on the national scope.

Interest in scrip money, particularly the self-liquidating stamped type, increased steadily during 1932, and in the last two weeks the number of proposals for its adoption nationally has multiplied rapidly. Indorsement of the plan by Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University, a short time ago gave impetus to the movement, with the result that at the present time several business men and economists, whose knowledge of the intricacies of currency and monetary matters is doubted by banking authorities, have given their approval to the scheme.

SCRIP REVIVED IN GERMANY

Originating in 1890 and more or less dormant since that time until it was revived in Germany and Austria about a year and a half ago, the stamped-scrip idea has bounded rapidly into national prominence and, following its try out in Hawarden, Iowa, is now being hailed as a way out of the depression.

Stamped scrip is the outgrowth of various forms of barter plans, of which there are now about 150 in 29 States. Of these, stamped scrip is on the way to being adopted in about 45 communities, which have watched with interest the Hawarden and the Evanston, Ill., experiments.

Briefly, stamped scrip is a certificate with a certain number of spaces on which a stamp is to be attached each time the certificate changes hands. For instance, on one of \$1 denomination, 52 spaces are provided for the affixing of a 2-cent stamp for each transaction. The stamps, which are bought from the issuing body, which may be a local government or a chamber of commerce, creates a redemption fund, so that when the 52 stamps are attached and canceled the \$1 scrip can be redeemed for that amount, the extra 4 cents accruing to the sponsors for printing and other charges.

In the plan now operative the scrip has had a very limited circulation. In Hawarden, three hundred \$1 certificates were issued to the unemployed for work on public improvements, and acceptance of the scrip was confined to local merchants. Since these merchants could not pay their suppliers in scrip, the bulk of it circulated among themselves, although part of it went to the payment of light and gas bills. Toledo plans a \$500,000 issue of scrip.

DENIED AS FIAT MONEY

Sponsors of the plan claim that its self-redemption feature takes it out of the class of fiat money and that it is a substitute for actual currency backed by gold, only in the sense that mortgages, installment buying, and other similar devices are substitutes.

Indicative of the type of scrip plans on a national scale being offered in various quarters but on a somewhat more ambitious basis than most, is one suggested here last week by J. Briskman, a financing broker. Mr. Briskman would create a private dividend paying corporation, with the Federal Treasury as trustee, which would issue stamped scrip to the extent of \$100 to every individual over 16 years of age in the United States. The scrip, in the form of a "mortgage" certificate, issued fortnightly in 10 installments alternating at \$10 and \$11, would contain 26 spaces for the affixing of a 4-cent stamp for each turnover. The extra 4 cents for each \$1 would accrue to the corporation to cover financing, printing, and other overhead expenses. To prevent stagnation banks would not accept the scrip until it was fully redeemable.

Adoption of such a plan, Mr. Briskman claimed, would immediately start trade and commerce booming, aid the banks through increasing their liquidity, provide more money for taxation by the Government, put an end to hoarding through restoration of business confidence, and divert collected unemployment-relief funds to self-liquidating public works.

Leading banking authorities, however, disclaim any such benefits from a national scrip plan and hold that, on the contrary, it would lead to financial chaos. Bad money always drives out good money, they declared, and the first indications of any national legislation, which would be necessary to legalize scrip, would start a chain of untoward events.

WOULD CREATE CHAOS

In the first place, the immediate impression would be that the scrip offering was a prelude to abandonment of the gold standard, they said. Foreign countries and investors would immediately start to sell the dollar and American securities. Depositors in American banks would withdraw their savings, investors would sell stocks, mortgages, and other securities backed by gold, and the general result would be the same as that resulting from any other debasement of the national currency.

Such bankers admitted that scrip may be of some benefit as a purely local proposition, but they tabooed it as a national project. They viewed its development as a symptom of the current hysterical demands that "something be done."

One banker declared that only the sound orthodox plans of action are necessary to start a revival, citing the instance of Germany a few years after the war. At that time, he said, the debasement of German currency had plunged the country into a severe depression, but once the currency was stabilized an immediate upturn developed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Kean	Schuyler
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Sheppard
Bailey	Davis	Keyes	Shipstead
Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Shortridge
Barbour	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Barkley	Fess	Lewis	Smoot
Bingham	Fletcher	Logan	Stelwer
Black	Frazier	Long	Stephens
Blaine	George	McGill	Swanson
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Glenn	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Townsend
Broussard	Gore	Moses	Trammell
Bulkey	Grammer	Neely	Tydings
Bulw	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Hastings	Nye	Walcott
Caraway	Hatfield	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hawes	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Hebert	Reynolds	Wheeler
Copeland	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	White
Costigan	Hull	Robinson, Ind.	
Couzens	Johnson	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Do I understand the Senator from Louisiana yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has yielded to the Senator from Texas for a speech and therefore yields the floor.

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, shall this Nation retreat from an ideal—an ideal which has demonstrated its necessity and worth? Thirteen years ago America planted the ideal of prohibition in the organic document of its being, the Federal Constitution. It is now called upon to reverse its action. A nation can not trifle with its ideals.

The repeal of prohibition would be the beginning of the dismemberment of the soul of America. The Constitution of the United States as it now stands is the best answer of the ages to the aspirations for freedom and self-government. Its provision for prohibition is the loftiest peak the march of man has reached.

Prohibition marks an advance in the application of government and law to human rights of such significance as to justify every effort for its retention in the Constitution. What greater protection for human rights may be conceived than the preservation of the ability to enjoy these rights to the fullest possible extent. Beverage alcohol is a menace to human rights. It imperils the right to life at its very fountain, diminishing the chances of the unborn child of a drinking parent to see the light of day. It impairs the right of untold millions to a normal existence because, to use the language of a noted pathologist, Dr. Emil Bogen, no other poison causes so many deaths or leads to and intensifies so many diseases, both physical and mental, as does alcohol in the various forms in which it is taken. It threatens the right to live, because drink-crazed men will maim and kill. It endangers the right to security of life and limb, because drink-influenced men at machine controls will make lanes of travel welters of death and mutilation. It destroys the rights of human beings to food, to shelter, to clothing, comfort, decency, culture, and the general facilities of civilization—to freedom from terrorism and abuse. It violates the right of society to a moral, healthful, thrifty, intelligent, and foresighted citizenship. It annuls the right to liberty, because liberty is the power of individuals to exercise their entire faculties for the most beneficial conduct of government and life. The prohibition of beverage alcohol conserves the fundamental rights of man.

To repeal prohibition is to put the right to appetite above the rights to life, to liberty, and to happiness in their true significance. It is to defile an ideal, the ideal that places the higher liberties above the lower and the obsolete ones. In restraining the lower liberty of appetite for alcohol prohibition makes room for the higher liberties of thrift and health, efficiency and judgment, of rightful conduct, and moral discrimination which carry society to happier, more prosperous, and more exalted levels.

The human organism is built upon disciplines, coordinations, restraints, reactions developed and communicated by brain and nerves into conduct and action. Alcohol taken as a beverage poisons the tissues of the brain, cripples and disorganizes nerve activity, and thus pollutes, distorts, destroys the sources of normal life and progress. It attacks first of all the most delicate and vital brain centers, whence emanate conceptions of right and truth and justice, of policies of enterprise and government; impairs the capacity of the nerves to carry the impulses of efficient action; and long before its effects on the body are visible, long before what is commonly supposed to be intoxication visibly develops, it has started a human unit on the road to moral collapse, mental incapacity, and physical enfeeblement. Of course, individuals pause at different stages on that road. Some halt and some retrace their steps. But multitudes go on unable to combat the lure of the drug until they form a load beneath which civilization staggers and descends.

The danger to the United States of a return to legalized alcohol can not be overstated. The scale on which machinery and enterprise must operate to preserve and to increase in this country the widest diffusion of the facilities of modern life any nation has ever known produces an exhaustion and a strain calling for the most serious attention. Add to this the problem of caring for millions of the homeless and the unemployed, of finding relief from the most devastating economic upheaval in human annals, and the need for a sober nation with all the abilities of its people intact and militant becomes so pressing as to admit of no denial. The temptation to find a temporary forgetfulness in a deadly, narcotic drug like alcohol becomes more formidable as the crisis lingers and modern demands and responsibilities on the human make-up multiply. We are now cultivating the substitution of healthful and normal forms of relaxation and recreation for the use of alcohol. The repeal of prohibition would be fatal to this fundamental step in human progress.

And so we confront one of the most critical decisions in all history. National prohibition and the most productive years of the mechanical era began together. Prohibition was the culmination of a succession of welfare measures which paralleled the growing application of machine power and scientific knowledge to human industry, a movement which acquired its full momentum in the United States shortly after the Civil War. The purpose of these enactments was to bring scientific knowledge to the doorsteps of the people, to enable them to meet the exactions and the emergencies of the mechanized régime, to protect them against the vast concentrations of machinery and wealth rising on every side and converting the once independent masses into tenants and employees—to shield society against the accidents, calamities, diseases, vices, crimes, and deaths attending the new period—to equip humanity for the operation and the mastery of the machine. General addiction to the alcoholic drug which in a less strenuous time had been permitted under more or less rigid limitations became intolerable in an age of mechanical transport and manufacture, of numberless units and mighty masses of machinery, of organizations and enterprises of gigantic scope, requiring muscles like iron, nerves like adamant, integrity like granite, minds with the accuracy of the modern instruments and engines to be operated and controlled.

But for the realization by industry and commerce that liquor was an obstacle to their expansion prohibition might have never come. The liquor trade had itself been made the subject of mass production, one of the chief features of the machine epoch, and had become one of the most

powerful, dangerous, and insolent of the special interests. In the effort to maintain and to extend its sway it became an agency of corruption in practically every unit of government, from precinct and township to county, State, and Nation. It took on nation-wide proportions, causing the American people to expend for intoxicants over \$2,000,000,000 a year, consuming annually an amount equal to an average of more than 20 gallons for every man, woman, and child within our borders. Its suspension during the World War emphasized its wasteful, nonessential, evil, and antisocial nature, and it was thrust aside not only in the interest of morals but of efficient quantity fabrication of useful things and of safe and effective operation of machinery.

Then ensued that marvelous period of machine production from 1920 to 1929, which, accompanied by national prohibition, amazed and thrilled the world. It was marked by the greatest efficiency and the largest pay per individual worker the world has ever witnessed. Next came the collapse, due to speculation, which made the Mississippi bubble and the tulip craze conservative in comparison; and a time of loss, stagnation, want, and unemployment that might well have been succeeded by revolution and by chaos had the liquor traffic been in operation on a legalized basis. Liquor propagandists, bountifully financed, capitalized the general dissatisfaction and depression to start a movement against prohibition, a movement artificial in its character, venal in its origin, and false in its representations. As a result of that movement, declarations appeared in both party platforms for repeal or alteration of the eighteenth amendment and resolutions are now pending in Congress to such ends. These declarations had no place in political party platforms, because prohibition is not a party question. I stated during my speaking trip in behalf of the Democratic ticket in the last campaign that I had not changed my views on prohibition, that I was opposed to both Democratic and Republican planks on that subject, that I supported the Democracy on economic grounds. The present movement for repeal obtained its principal impetus from the plethoric pocketbooks of a few millionaires, determined to shift the weight of taxation from their own shoulders to the masses even if it doomed the masses to perpetual poverty and woe.

I am a believer in the people's rule and in the right of petition. Ordinarily I favor the submission of any question to the people whenever there is a genuine desire on the part of any substantial number for submission. Indeed, I said as much in this Senate when speaking in behalf of the submission of the eighteenth amendment, adding that I would vote for submission, even if I were an antiprohibitionist, in order that the matter might be decided by the proper tribunal. That situation, however, is no precedent for this. The present condition is the result of paid propaganda and not of any spontaneous movement among the people. I am opposed, therefore, to submission under the present circumstances and at the present time. The country has been saturated with such subtle and such vicious misrepresentations regarding prohibition that it would be impossible to secure a fair hearing on the facts at this juncture. A feeling amounting almost to an obsession has been widely established to the effect that the return of liquor will solve the farm problem, conquer the depression, supply the needed revenue, balance the Budget, and restore prosperity. The treatment of dry speakers by the screaming mobs in the galleries of both the great party conventions at Chicago is a sample of the difficulty at this time of securing a fair and decent hearing for prohibition.

A so-called referendum on submission was held in connection with the state-wide Democratic primary for the nomination of State officials in my home State of Texas last year. The dries ignored the referendum almost solidly. They voted for State officers, but refrained almost entirely from voting on submission. A state-wide meeting of Texas dry leaders advised the dries to take no part in the referendum on the very just ground that the sudden order for the referendum without prior notice and within less than six weeks from the primary in which it was to be held did

not afford sufficient time for proper presentation and discussion and was resulting in widespread protest and confusion among Democratic voters. Although practically unopposed and left to dominate the situation, the forces for submission polled less than half the entire primary vote, or 405,309 out of 973,041. The remaining 567,732 either did not vote at all on submission or voted against submission. Of this last number 450,114 did not vote at all on submission and 117,618 voted against submission. In my judgment, it can not be said that a vote of less than half the participants in that primary for submission was such an indorsement as I am required by the Texas election law relating to Senators to observe. In my judgment, a majority of all of those voting in the primary for all purposes was necessary before the referendum could be said to have been a representative expression of the will of the primary voters and such an expression as I would be justified in following.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand the Senator to say that if an election is held, we are going to have to make all persons entitled to vote come in and mark the ballot one way or the other, or they do not count?

Mr. SHEPPARD. This was not an election in the usual sense. It was a referendum to determine the sentiment of the people and in my judgment a majority vote of the people taking part in the primary would be required to indicate that sentiment.

The controversy over prohibition involves more than the immediate merits of prohibition itself. It involves the ability of this Nation to make the most of the machine age in the interest of the people. If prohibition is repealed and the liquor traffic restored, economic and industrial advancement can not be resumed on the scale of its former hope and promise. Repeal will mean the definite arrest of human progress. We were well on the way before the crash of 1929 to a point where there would have been available for all our people on terms within universal reach a full share of the commodities, facilities, requirements, comforts, and refinements of modern civilization. If the masses are again to be doped and drugged with alcohol on the immense commercial basis contemplated by the beer bill and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment—to be compelled to exchange sobriety and efficiency for the misery and the incompetency of an alcoholized status—then neither government nor industry will ever see the time when the best possibilities of our country will be realized. The golden age of plenitude for all, which seemed so near a short while ago, when over-optimism and unfortunate governmental policies temporarily disorganized and suspended the forward trend, will have been postponed indefinitely. Henry Ford has well said that no one wants any drinking man to be at the mercy of machinery, and that no one wants to be at the mercy of any machine in the hands of a drinking man; that machinery must be soberly made as well as soberly driven.

As an indication of what may be expected in the event of repeal observe the accidents on the highways of wet Great Britain. The number of persons killed on the roads of Great Britain in 1931 was 6,691, or about 18 a day. The number injured was 202,119, or about 561 a day. The authorities agree that the principal cause of these deaths and injuries is the legalized and regulated liquor traffic—the liquor traffic “brought into the open,” as the American wets like to say. There are approximately 1,500,000 motor vehicles in Great Britain, 26,500,000 in the United States. On the basis of the number of cars on the highways of both countries we would have, in a wet United States on the same ratio, 113,000 killed and 3,400,000 injured in this country every year—more than twice as many killed as we lost by battle deaths in the World War, nearly ten times as many injured. In dry United States the number killed per annum by accidents connected with mechanical traffic is between a third and a fourth of the figure in wet Britain in proportion to the number of cars on the road.

Evangeline Booth, commander in chief of the Salvation Army in the United States, who was in intimate touch with the effect of the liquor traffic on American conditions when it was in legalized operation and who is in reliable position to predict the result of its legal reinstatement, says that to repeal the eighteenth amendment will be to fling again wide the gates of our country to an army of slaughter such as never tramped its relentless heels upon any blood-soaked fields of war, to give carte blanche to a monster of destruction which has strewn the shores of time with more mangled forms than any other instrument of death; that if the eighteenth amendment were to be abandoned, there will not be a drinking den in the world, not a gambling hell in the remotest seaport, not a haunt of vice in the most pagan city, not a purveyor of opium and other drugs, not an organizer of the white-slave traffic, not an exploiter of the native races in Africa and Australia that will not raise a shout of joy in triumph over the foremost nation in the world, where the forces that retard human progress, destroy human happiness, and disfigure the image of God imprinted on the human face would have vanquished that righteousness which exalteth a people.

Returning to the comparison with wet Britain, let us note the fact that before the recent economic crash the drink bill in that country was \$1,500,000,000. The proportionate figure for a wet United States would be more than \$4,000,000,000. Does anybody want to see a situation like that in the United States?

Lord Rosebery once announced that if Britain did not rule the liquor traffic, the liquor traffic would rule Britain. Ownership of brewery and distillery stock is so widely distributed among persons of influence and position in Great Britain that no attempt to end the trade in that country has ever made any serious headway. There were severe restrictions during the World War, but they were largely removed with the advent of peace. In the United States the liquor traffic had become the largest single political power in America when the onslaught of industrial and moral forces brought about its outlawry through the passage of the eighteenth amendment. But the traffic has never for a moment laid down its arms. It has fought the Constitution and the law as bitterly when it was prohibited as it did when it was regulated. If it should be again legalized, the corruption it would spread from Washington to the smallest units of government throughout the Nation would present as sinister a problem and mark as backward a step as the evil of drink itself.

Prohibition has made such progress in helping conditions as not only to justify but to demand its continuance. The figures and studies of the Government indicate a decline in liquor consumption from an average of 23 gallons per capita in wet 1914, the last unqualified wet year, with illicit drink included, to an average of 7½ gallons in dry 1930, including illicit drink. Does anyone with the good of the country at heart want to return to the former status? The claim of increased drinking is due to the fact that happenings among people of station and influence and their satellites are chronicled far and wide while the doings of the vast bulk of our inhabitants who earn a living with the labor of their hands never come into public notice. What a perversion of reason it is to say that because the prominent few insist on breaking the law and becoming partners with the underworld, drink must be forced upon the masses with its accompanying poverty and degradation. Members of the social sets speak of their little coteries as if they constituted the Nation. Because they see drinking in their own circles they think the whole world drinks. “Everybody is going out of town,” they will say, for instance, of Washington in the early summer, when, as a matter of fact, nearly 500,000 people are remaining in town and will stay in town.

The charge that drinking in the colleges has increased since prohibition was exploded by a questionnaire sent to 257 college presidents in 45 States in 1930. Forty-four replied that there was no drinking among students. Forty-seven reported that drinking among students was, as it had always been, unknown or almost unknown. One hundred

and forty-six answered that there was less drinking than before prohibition. Eight stated that drinking was about the same. Seven said that conditions were bad. Three—only three—declared that conditions were worse than before the passage of the eighteenth amendment. The statement that the drink habit has grown among young people in the secondary schools is equally unfounded. Some time ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication from Dr. Charles E. Barker, of Grand Rapids, Mich. He has been a lecturer in the high schools of this country for more than 18 years. During all that time he has spent eight months a year speaking almost every day before the students, his work taking him into almost every State in the country. In answer to an inquiry from me last year, he replied that, with the exception of a few high schools in some of the large cities located in what might be termed the wealthy residential sections, the principals had informed him that drinking among students was practically nil and that the eighteenth amendment had been of immense benefit to the country. The National Association of School Superintendents, which met at Detroit in 1931, voted almost unanimously against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. These superintendents would have been among the first to denounce prohibition if it had caused drinking among students.

No profounder disaster could befall this Nation than the surrender of an ideal, an ideal embodied in its basic law, proclaimed to all the world and demonstrated to be just. From Sinai with its crown of fire came ideals that have remained in human statutes through the centuries despite continuous and wholesale violation. Most of them are prohibitions, including thou shalt not murder and thou shalt not steal. The eighteenth amendment repeats those objectives in another form when it says, in effect, thou shalt not give men drink that makes them murder and induces them to steal. All that there is worth while in government and in life is the attempt to accomplish what is right and to establish what is just. We can never gain perfection. Give up the effort to ascend and the return to the wallow and the mire will have become inevitable. Run down the flag of prohibition and run up the flag of drink and the saddest transformation that ever marked the struggle of mankind for its own redemption will have been achieved. It will be the first time this Nation ever abandoned a principle or deserted a responsibility. It will be the first time this Nation ever muffled its drums and lowered its standards in retreat from a position once taken and shown to be right. The cause of liberty, liberty that represses appetite and passion in order that we may not be led into temptation and therefore into bondage, in order that the paths of opportunity and achievement for the humblest human being, of progress, and of promise for governments and men may know no barrier which the law may help to remove, will have been definitely repudiated.

Let the movement for repeal be resisted by every element in America that would preserve the essence of our freedom, the meaning of our history, the basis of our advancement, and the character of our most sacred obligations to humanity.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is a source of much regret to me that I shall not be able hereafter to listen to the annual speech of the Senator from Texas. I merely wish to call his attention to the fact that this is a double anniversary to-day, not only the anniversary of the incoming of prohibition, but it is also the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the civil service reform act, and I wish only to observe that at the present moment the application of the latter act, the civil service reform act, with its amendments, is causing to the party of the Senator from Texas quite as much difficulty as is the Volstead Act with its amendments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, we are amply able to meet all the difficulties to which the Senator alludes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire makes that confession during a Republican administration. I thank him for his confession. [Laughter.]

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE CALVIN COOLIDGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to arrange a program for the joint session of the two Houses in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late President Calvin Coolidge the following Senators: The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Woman's Department of the Council of Churches, of Wichita, Kans., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification of the national prohibition law, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Garden City and Oswego, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by Binghamton Council, No. 206, Knights of Columbus, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring a change in the site of the post office from Wall Street to Washington Street, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a resolution adopted by James A. Hill Post, No. 1455, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Bath, N. Y., protesting against reductions in the compensation or disability allowances of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Edward J. Murphy, Frederick C. Doherty, and other citizens of the United States, praying that the rights of teachers and other American citizens to pensions or retirement privileges from the Philippine government be adequately protected in the event of the passage of legislation granting independence to the Philippine Islands, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., and the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia or the country at large, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALCOTT presented memorials from the following units of the American Legion Auxiliary: Albert Johnson, No. 90, of Collinsville; Gensi-Viola, No. 36, of Windsor Locks; Torrington, No. 38, of Torrington; Treadway-Cavanaugh, No. 64, of East Hampton; Swanson, No. 67, of North Grosvonor Dale; Leon Goodale, No. 56, of Glastonbury; Carlson-Sjovall, No. 105, of Cromwell; Harry W. Congdon, No. 11, of Bridgeport; Clinton, No. 66, of Clinton; Meriden, No. 45, of Meriden; Russell K. Bourne, No. 23, of Wethersfield; Robert A. LaPlace, No. 18, of Essex; Harry G. Faulk, No. 113, of Old Saybrook; and Kiltonic, No. 72, of Southington; YD Post, No. 130, the American Legion, of New Haven; Leon Goodale Post, No. 56, the American Legion, of Glastonbury; and the Connecticut Department, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, of Bristol, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the making of any reductions in appropriations for the Army and the Navy, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Norwalk section, National Council of Jewish Women, of Norwalk, Conn., praying that the United States take the initiative in shaping a constructive policy for the satisfactory adjustment of international debts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from Chester Post, No. 97, the American Legion, of Chester; Hamden Post, Auxiliary Unit, No. 88, the American Legion, of Hamden; and Harry E. Johnson Post, No. 116, the American

Legion, of Bloomfield, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of House bill 8578, the so-called widows and orphans' pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented papers in the nature of memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Hamden, Great Plain, and Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification of the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented papers in the nature of petitions from the Sarah Whitman Hooker Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of West Hartford, and the Litchfield County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Watertown, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called Dies bill, being the bill (H. R. 12044) to provide for the exclusion and expulsion of alien communists, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROOKHART presented memorials and papers in the nature of memorials from W. F. Clayburg, pastor, and officers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Coon Rapids; Mrs. Elva Jessup and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Union, Iowa; Mrs. Lena Edgerton, president of Cedar County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other citizens, of West Branch; Mrs. Stella Heaton and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Webster; Mrs. F. F. Yapp, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other citizens of Waterloo; Mrs. Nellie Fritz, president, and other citizens and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Malvern; Mrs. Ella Hatten and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hamburg; Fred Fuller and other citizens of Waukon; E. W. Seeley and other citizens of Manchester; Mrs. Joe Flint and other citizens of Centerville; Mrs. Fern Casady and other citizens of Exline, Mrs. Mildred Jones and other citizens of Gilman; R. C. Jackson and other citizens of Manilla; Mrs. Florence Slusser and other citizens of Indianola; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth L. Mosher and other citizens of Salem; Mrs. Charles L. Kelsey and other citizens of Manilla; Mrs. W. S. Handy and other citizens of Goldfield and Eagle Grove; Mrs. Eva Robinson and other citizens of Manchester; Mrs. Charles Jordison and other citizens of Manchester; C. A. Field and other citizens of Ottumwa; Mrs. J. J. Kidder and other citizens of Manchester; Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Johnson and other citizens of Knoxville; Mrs. J. H. Downs and other citizens of Bondurant; Mrs. I. E. Miner and other citizens of Bussey; Mrs. R. D. Mowry and other citizens of Wyoming; Mrs. Mary Grace Ellis and other citizens of Greene; Dr. Winifred M. Miller and 92 other citizens of Denison; and Olin F. Shaw, of Adel; and other citizens of Dallas County; all in the State of Iowa; remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TYDINGS presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the States of Maryland, New Jersey, and New York, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia or the country at large, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of the Montgomery County (Md.) Civic Federation, praying that in the passage of legislation to merge the Georgetown Gas Light Co. and the Washington Gas Light Co., of the District of Columbia, provision be made to safeguard the consumers of gas in Montgomery County, Md., and, if possible, to secure to them rates that will be uniform throughout greater Washington, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County (Md.) Civic Federation, opposing reductions in the salaries of Federal employees and continuation of the furlough system, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens, being sea-food dealers, of Crisfield, Md., remonstrating against the increased rate on first-class postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the council of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of the State of Maryland, protesting against the expenditure of funds for hospitalization in Government hospitals of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, and favoring a discontinuance of such service for non-service-connected disabilities throughout the Nation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILD LIFE RESOURCES

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, I present a memorandum relating to the work and expenditures of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wild Life Resources, which I ask may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RELATING TO THE WORK AND EXPENDITURES OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILD LIFE RESOURCES

The Special Committee on Conservation of Wild Life Resources was authorized by Senate Resolution 246 adopted by the Senate on April 17, 1930. The committee consists of five members: Senator WALCOTT, chairman; Senator HAWES, vice chairman; and Senators PITTMAN, NORBECK, and McNARY.

At the outset the committee selected as its secretary Morris Legendre, of New Orleans, and a month or so later selected as its special investigator Carl D. Shoemaker, who for many years was head of the fish and game department of the State of Oregon.

In December, 1931, Mr. Legendre resigned and Mr. Shoemaker was selected in his stead. Since this time he has been both secretary and special investigator.

In the beginning it is well to call attention to the inquiries into which the committee expected to direct its attention and the relationship these bear to the outdoors and recreation in general.

There are in the United States 7,000,000 men and women who annually take out licenses to fish in the streams of America. The States issue 6,000,000 hunting licenses annually to their people. Allowing for duplication in the issuance of combination fishing and hunting licenses and those who take out both separately, it is safe to assume that there are at least 10,000,000 adults in the United States who annually purchase licenses for the upkeep of conservation and fish and game departments of the States. These men and women are drawn from all walks of life: doctors, jurists, learned professors and the clergy, the merchant and his clerk, the automobile mechanic and the proprietor of his garage are all alike endowed with this love of the out-of-doors and are among those who frequent the streams and forests and fields of our country in the pursuit of the wily trout, the fleet four-footed game animals, and the upland as well as migratory birds.

The pursuit of our wild life for pleasure and sport is not a business. Therefore it has no great cohesive organizations similar to those involved in transportation, industry, and agriculture. Yet it represents an annual expenditure of more than \$650,000,000 for purchases of fishing tackle, ammunition, and kindred items contributing to the enjoyment of wild life and the out-of-doors.

The wild life resources of our Nation are of incalculable value. They afford excellent outdoor recreation which is reflected in the health and well-being of our citizenship. No study of these resources can be made without coming in contact with the outdoor lovers of the communities and districts in which the study or inquiry is being made. Any one investigating the fishery resources of the upper Mississippi wild life and fish refuge, for instance, can not do so without some time spent upon the waters. Yet there are those who would criticize a committee for doing what is needed to be done but which on the surface appears to be mere pleasure.

All over this country in every city and every rural community there are organizations known as Izaak Walton League chapters, rod and gun clubs, game protective associations, fish and game clubs, duck clubs—all composed of enthusiastic local men and women gathered together from all walks of life in that particular community. When a Senate investigating committee goes into a community it must perforce meet, talk, and fraternize with the members of these organizations. The stake is the perpetuation of the wild life resources within that region and the formulation of a national policy perpetuating the wild life resources of the entire country.

Our committee in its first season's investigations found a rapidly decreasing supply of wild life throughout the Nation. It found further that drastic measures in many instances would have to be applied to continue and replace the terrific inroads which civilization, overfishing, and overshooting had made in the supply.

There is an increasing and quickening interest being taken throughout America in the conservation of our wild life due in part to the efforts of this special Senate committee and to the excellent work being carried on by the national and local non-official conservation organizations and the official State bodies engaged in this work. During the first session of the Seventy-second Congress, which convened in December, 1931, and closed in

July following, there were introduced in the House 96 bills and in the Senate 78 bills affecting in some manner the outdoor and recreational aspects of our people.

Among the sportsmen of America and among the official and nonofficial organizations carrying on conservation work there is unanimous opinion that this committee on conservation of wild life resources should be continued. It has received the indorsement of the American Game Association and the Izaak Walton League, the International Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, the Western Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, and many other similar but smaller organizations. It is felt by these bodies that the special committee has been of great value and assistance in bringing about a broader viewpoint on this subject of conservation, not only in Federal activities but in the States as well.

During the recesses of Congress in 1930 and 1931 the committee made extensive inquiries into many phases of the wild life resources of our Nation. Through its suggestions and cooperation with other agencies it has been the means of securing much favorable action as well as attention. In Alaska, for instance, the new regulations giving additional protection to moose, brown bear, and mountain sheep were predicated upon recommendations of this committee. Through the investigation it conducted on the Upper Mississippi Wild Life and Fish Refuge, the expenditure of the \$350,000 on the part of the Federal Government in the purchase of this great recreational and wilderness area bordering on four States has been safeguarded. Through its recommendations after extensive hearings on the migratory waterfowl shortage, an open season of 60 days was restored throughout the country.

In the Jackson Hole country in Wyoming, by request, the committee considered the complex conservation situation which had developed there over a number of years. Here, perhaps, was the most aggravated wild-life problem to be dealt with. The greatest remaining herd of elk in our country roams throughout that region, as do moose, deer, and other forms of wild life. Here the Federal Government had years ago created the Yellowstone National Park and more recently the Grand Teton National Park just south of the Yellowstone. Much of the land of the Jackson Hole region had been purchased by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whose original intention was to transfer it to the Government as an addition to the Grand Teton. At the lower end of Jackson Hole the Biological Survey had a small experimental elk farm. Winter feeding of the elk had become necessary. Surrounding the national parks and the rim of the mountain sides of Jackson Hole are national forests. There is considerable public domain in the same vicinity. Small ranchers and stock raisers have grazing rights throughout that territory. A great reclamation project for the Snake River Country was in operation at the outlet to Jackson Lake. The State of Wyoming has jurisdiction over the wild life within that region. Here, then, are found the State agencies having to do with conservation as well as the Federal agencies—the Forest Service, the Park Service, the Biological Survey, the Reclamation Service, the General Land Office, and the Bureau of Fisheries—together with private interests in grazing and agriculture—all in juxtaposition with each other with a complexity of interests which lacked in harmony.

The committee was invited to investigate the whole condition by a United States Senator from Wyoming and by the governor of that State, as well as by the Federal agencies involved. Out of the series of hearings and investigations made in that region there has grown a better understanding and the problem is nearing solution.

Many of the committee's investigations, therefore, as may be seen, have been directed for the most part to those problems which have been troublesome to Federal conservation activities and encouraging results have been achieved.

The total appropriations which the committee has obtained up to date amount to about \$17,500 per year since its creation. In the public press and in certain magazines from time to time there have appeared stories relating to the expenditures of the committee. Some of these stories have been facetious, others humorous, and still others in a ridiculing vein. For instance, a number of writers have directed attention to investigations conducted by the committee at Moran in Jackson Hole, Wyo., where a tip of \$20 was reported as given to the waitress. Writers do not state that there were seven people in the party and that the investigation covered 17 days. When reduced to actual per service tips this amounts to 5¢ cents per meal. All other so-called tips were to be divided among the employees of the hostelry and are equally small. Another item in this same investigation which has been frequently called to the attention of the public was that of tips to Joe Allen and five others, including "two horse wranglers," amounting to a total of \$70. It is a matter of fact that the committee offered to hire saddle horses for its trips through the elk and moose country. The sums given to these men were actually much less than the cost of hiring their horses and their services. This investigation could not be done by automobile or on foot. Payment was refused and the so-called tips were, therefore, given to compensate in a small measure for the time and effort put forth on the part of Mr. Allen and the others.

Airplane travel and the use of automobiles, horses, and boats are essential in making any study or survey of the wild-life resources of our Nation. Time is an element which makes quick means of transportation necessary to conserve the time of those making the investigation. Airplanes are resorted to and are cheaper in the long run than to use some other means of transportation taking considerably longer in time. An instance of this was the

use of a plane over the region of Ten-Thousand Lakes in upper Minnesota, where the committee was investigating certain phases of work under the Shipstead-Noland bill. By canoes and portage—the only other means of transportation—it would have taken several weeks to cover the same area covered in two or three days by plane and, of course, the expense would have been much greater. The members of the committee paid their expenses of a personal nature, but in some cases it appears that certain items of such character were charged to the committee—the total of such items does not amount to more than \$50—and undoubtedly were not brought to the attention of the individual members of the committee by the secretary. But at least they have the novelty of being an honest and absolutely rigorous account of its expenditures.

The investigation of wild-life conditions is inherently linked with the out-of-doors, with the use of boats, guides, horses, and automobiles; and the unthinking jump to the conclusion that it is a pleasure and vacation trip which is being taken instead of a serious undertaking to study a serious problem.

Taking it by and large, the expenditures of the Special Committee on Wild Life Resources have been more than justified by the accomplishments achieved. Such a committee should continue in the Senate as one of its standing committees. Ten million people of the United States are interested in the subject, and certainly there is ample opportunity for the services and usefulness of such a committee in the Senate.

BRANCH BANKING

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from F. D. Drumheller, executive vice president, and so forth, of Charleston, W. Va., in opposition to the branch-banking provision of the bill now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., January 13, 1933.

Senator M. M. NEELY:

We are much opposed to section of Glass bill pertaining to state-wide branch banking. Hope you will use your influence in defeating this section.

F. D. DRUMHELLER,

Executive Vice President, the Kanawha Valley Bank Building.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 5387) granting a franking privilege to Grace Goodhue Coolidge, reported it without amendment.

YELLOWSTONE AND GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 226) to investigate activities in connection with the proposed enlargement of the Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, reported it with amendments, and it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5415) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Stickney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5416) granting a pension to Harriet M. Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAREY and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

A bill (S. 5417) to extend the operation of the act entitled "An act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law," approved April 1, 1932; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 5418) amending section 301 (a) 10 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 relative to the acquisition of sites and the construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 5419) granting a pension to Lizzie Clinkenbeard; and

A bill (S. 5420) granting an increase of pension to Samantha E. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5421) for the relief of Thomas Michael Shannon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 5422) granting a pension to Cassie Randolph; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5423) granting a pension to James O. Boylan (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5424) granting a pension to John Porter Naanes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5425) to correct the military record of John Pate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTOTT:

A bill (S. 5426) for the relief of Archibald MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 5427) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in Ottawa County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 5428) for the relief of Mary A. Rockwell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5429) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by adding a new section to include for purposes of disability compensation only representatives of the American Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare Board, the Salvation Army, and all kindred American organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 5430) to authorize the appointment and retirement of Richmond Pearson Hobson in the grade of rear admiral in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5431) to grant the consent of Congress to George Washington-Wakefield Memorial Bridge, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5432) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reappoint Roy E. Cole in the police department of said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 5433) for the relief of certain settlers on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 234) to provide for a change of site of the Federal building to be constructed in Binghamton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000 for a survey by the Bureau of Entomology of those regions of the United States subject to grasshopper infestation, and for preventing recurrences therein of such infestation, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13872, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13710, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill to insert:

"In the expenditure of appropriations in this act, or appropriations hereafter made for the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior shall, unless in his discretion the interest of the Government will not permit, purchase, or contract for, within the limits of the United States, only articles of the growth, production, and/or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding that such articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States may cost more, if such excess of cost be not unreasonable. In giving effect to this section

special consideration shall be given to the domestic article where the raw material of which the article is made is grown in the United States and the article is manufactured in the United States."

PROPOSED CONSIDERATION OF VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted a resolution (S. Res. 328), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas section 8 of Article I of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin * * *"; and

Whereas the Congress has exercised this power through its agent, the Federal reserve system; and

Whereas such constitutional power so exercised regulated the value of the dollar in 1920 so that said dollar, based upon the Federal Department of Labor's statistics, had a buying power of approximately 50 cents, and since 1920 the Congress, acting through its agent, has increased the buying power or value of said dollar as relating to farm products and as measured by said labor index to a point in excess of 200 cents; and

Whereas through such congressional regulation of the value of the dollar, said dollar has become so valuable that the people can not secure sufficient dollars with which to pay their taxes, their interest, and their debts, and, as the inevitable result, taxes are unpaid, interest is in default, debts accumulate, and the people, under such burden of debts, are in involuntary revolt throughout the United States; and

Whereas neither the people nor the governments of the districts, cities, counties, States, and the Federal Government itself can longer economically exist under the dollar of such high valuation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of 27 Senators be appointed and authorized and requested to meet, organize, and act under the authority of said section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and said committee, when organized, is hereby authorized and requested to consider the present value of the dollar with relation to taxes, interest, and debts, and to make recommendations and report a plan or plans for reducing the value of such dollar.

SEC. 2. The committee herein provided for shall consist of the following Senators: BORAH, SMOOT, McNARY, NORRIS, CAPPER, BLAINE, VANDENBERG, WALTOTT, CAREY, FRAZIER, SHIPSTEAD, SMITH, WHEELER, GEORGE, BRATTON, BANKHEAD, HAYDEN, CONNALLY, LEWIS, LOGAN, LONG, DILL, MCGILL, BULOW, BAILEY, CARAWAY, and REYNOLDS.

SEC. 3. The committee, when organized, shall report to the Senate its plan of procedure as a basis for the granting to such committee such powers and funds as may be necessary to carry on the activities of such committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13975) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. WOOD of Indiana, and Mr. WASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THEODORE MARBURG ON TECHNOCRACY

Mr. WALTOTT. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the comments on technocracy of a distinguished citizen of Maryland, Mr. Theodore Marburg.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 25, 1932]

WE COULD BE IN WORSE CASE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Times printed extracts from the report of technocracy, a group of industrial engineers with which Columbia University is cooperating. It gives the installed horsepower of the United States as one thousand million, to direct which fewer than 1,000,000 men are required as against ten thousand million men that would have been needed "under any previous industrial system." The curious conclusion of the report is that "if America is to continue to operate this system she must break entirely with the past. All social, political, economic theories of the present must be thrown away. They are not even good points of departure for the formation of the rules of the new game."

Have not the framers of that report overlooked the fact that the one thousand million horsepower now installed in the United States represents past labor? Is it not, then, accumulated capital, and has it not, like all other capital, resulted from self-denial on the part of some one, i. e., his abstaining from using up all the

profits, whether derived from the labor of his own hands or from superior organization of the labor of others?

The countryside, in contrast to the city and its ways, is often said to be the pure product of nature. But the hand of man on the landscape—the white farm buildings, the gnarled apple orchard, the cattle in the drained meadow, for all of which the primeval forest has been cleared away; farm implements and poultry—does not this all represent past labor just as much as the city and its industries?

To discard capital accumulation is to go back to the savage with no tools and no provision for the morrow.

Manifestly, the sensible and the just thing is for modern man to continue to devise and accumulate labor-saving machinery and to give labor, including farm labor, the benefit of the added leisure and added income which all mankind ought to share as the result of labor-saving devices. Our present system, even with more leisure and greater rewards to the worker, will continue to have drawbacks, because lessening too drastically the penalties of inferiority due to lack of character will multiply the numbers of the inferior, but under the socialistic State we would be worse off. The institution of private property is the only thing that stands between society and forced labor; and men, by and large, would rather suffer want at times than be slaves all their lives, as under the Russian system.

THEODORE MARBURG.

NORTHEAST HARBOR, ME., September 19, 1932.

[From the New York Times of December 12, 1932]

TECHNOCRACY CRITICIZED

A STUDY OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW SYSTEM

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The secret guarded by "technocracy" is out. In his speech of December 3 at Cleveland, Mr. Howard Scott declares its aim to be "a social order without a price system, debts, or wages; but where persons between the ages of 25 and 45 would do all the work in 680 hours a year—or in 4 hours a day, 4 days in the week, 10 months in the year."

This is nothing other than communism. If men are not to have wages, how can they accumulate private property, how can the laboring man ever own his own home, or gather together sufficient capital to embark on an independent enterprise and rise from the ranks?

Some years ago I put to a group of communists the query, "Suppose the institution of private property is abolished and a man refuses to work, how are you going to make him work?" One of them replied, "We would starve him." My answer was, "No, you would not. That would be inhuman. What you would do would be to confine him and try to force him to work, which is slavery."

Unless you make slaves of "technocracy's" men between the ages of 25 and 45 who refuse to work, their numbers will swell to gigantic proportions.

Mr. Wayne W. Parrish's informing article in the November New Outlook reveals "technocracy" as a group of Jeremiahs. As Emerson remarked, truly "color is in the eye of the beholder." Instead of rejoicing at the wonderful progress made in labor-saving devices, they predict calamity from them unless we discard the system of private rewards which produce them.

What invention really means is the possibility of emancipating men and women from drudgery. As the results of human labor are multiple, give multiple rewards to labor—multiple wages and multiple leisure. This should have been done gradually, keeping pace with invention. The fact that it has not been done makes our problem more difficult; it does not make it insoluble.

Accumulated capital and inventions are simply a great reservoir from which men may drink without making exhausting and hazardous daily journeys into the desert. These men who would now abolish private property by abolishing wages and profits would not intentionally smash the dam, but they would tamper dangerously with the springs that feed the reservoir.

Our efforts may have centered blindly on producing too much of this or that. But such a thing as general overproduction does not exist. Is there too much wheat when millions over the world are going hungry? Is there too much cotton and wool and fuel when millions are inadequately clothed and are cold?

Work is a blessing, drudgery a curse. Guard every invention, guard every penny of capital, which simply represents past labor and self-denial, and use them to free mankind from drudgery.

Men to-day make a proper use of the blessed rest of Sunday. An additional day's leisure and shorter hours the rest of the week, giving opportunity to workers to fill their lungs with the pure air of the country and saturate their minds and hearts with the peace of it—is that going to ruin them?

Leisure has given birth to the arts, to the thinker, and to the spiritual leader. Many may abuse it. But will not the vast majority immensely profit by it?

THEODORE MARBURG.

BALTIMORE, December 6, 1932.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United

States with his objections to the House of Representatives, in which it originated.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, if Senators will do me the courtesy not unduly to interrupt, I promise not long to detain them with the expression of my views concerning the immediate matter before the Senate, namely, Shall the act the Congress passed, "An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes," become law, notwithstanding the disapproval of the President? That is the matter immediately calling for our further consideration. That is the question. That is the matter immediately calling for our consideration. Put in other words, the question is, Shall we adhere to the views we held when we passed the bill, notwithstanding the disapproval of the President?

As passed by both Houses the bill was and the bill is the result of the yielding of divergent views. We appreciate the solemn duty of the Executive, a quasi legislative branch of the Government, even as I trust we appreciate the gravity of our own duties. We are said to be of the legislative branch of the Government. Of course, the President has great legislative power by virtue of the veto power. It is with unfeigned respect for him, the occupant of the White House, and assuredly with unfeigned respect for those who may differ from me, that I trespass upon the attention of the Senate briefly to express my views, views which I have entertained for many, many years, views which I have expressed on the floor of the Senate many times and uttered elsewhere on many occasions. As I remarked, for certain reasons I shall not long trespass on the attention of the Senate.

We are dealing primarily with the welfare of 13,000,000 of people living remote from us, 7,000 or more miles from us, away across the Pacific. Who are they? They belong primarily or almost exclusively to the Malay race.

If time permitted and it were thought at all necessary, much might be said concerning the early history of these people and their progress through some two or three centuries. I assume, however, that the Senate is familiar with that history, and I can only hope that the people of this Nation are to some extent familiar with it.

There are some thirteen millions of Filipino people. True they are not all scientists, not all great men, nor are we all scientists or great men. They live on some 7,000 islands. They represent all stages of civilization. But, Mr. President, long before our forefathers planted their feet on this continent, certainly centuries before our forefathers fought and died for liberty, those distant people were petitioning, were praying, were fighting, were dying in order that they might be free. No words, however eloquent, can pay appropriate tribute to those dead men and dead women who fought for the precious jewel of independence or freedom. They are the people we have in our minds at this moment.

But I hasten to say that I am not forgetting the people of the United States of America. Speaking generally, while I am not unmindful of the welfare of other peoples, I hold uppermost and first in my thoughts the welfare of the men and women of our country. As a great constituent of mine in California, who has as his slogan "America first"—and with respect for him in his home at San Simeon I think I used that phrase innumerable times before it adorned the front pages of the San Francisco or the Los Angeles Examiner—I hold "America first," and in what I shall say to-day I am not overlooking or forgetting momentarily, or at all, the welfare of the men and the women and the children of this, your and my country. But I have a profound sympathy for the people of the Philippine Islands.

This thought may be worthy of utterance. They are Christian people. They worship even as the great mass of our people worship God. They are a Christian nation. Of course there are other religions, but when the Philippine people shall become, as I hope they shall soon become, an independent nation, that nation will be the only Christian nation in the Orient. There are those who think that the missionaries of the Christian faith are performing a sublime

and sacred duty when they are attempting to carry the banner of Jesus Christ around the earth. God's great and immortal ambassador, St. Paul, carried that banner and he said that God had made of one blood all the people who inherit the earth; but he hastened to add that He had set bounds for their habitation, thereby conveying the idea that whereas in one sense all mankind are of one blood as above the beasts of the field, yet there are bounds for their habitation. Hence we have, and always have had, separate nations.

The United States is a nation wedded to and smitten by a love of peace—although I regret to add that we have had several and some unnecessary wars. There are those who think that if we give independence to the Philippine Islands it will encourage or provoke or bring about war. With that view I utterly dissent and if time permits I shall point out why. Instead of provoking war, transfer of sovereignty to the Philippines will relieve the United States from the danger of war.

Some centuries ago Spain acquired jurisdiction by the sword over the Filipino people. I assume that everybody visualizes just where the Philippine Islands are, there south of Japan. For centuries Spain held sovereignty over those people. For centuries those people petitioned, prayed, fought, and died in order that they might achieve their independence. Providentially when they were fighting for their independence—providentially for them and perhaps providentially for the liberties of the world—we became engaged in war with Spain. That grand old man Aguinaldo was marshaling the forces and fighting against the power of Spain when Dewey sailed into the harbor of Manila. Dewey welcomed him. Aguinaldo and his followers had reason to think and believe that we, the United States, would treat the Filipino people as we had promised to treat and did treat the Cuban people; that if we succeeded in overthrowing Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines, we would at once transfer it to the inhabitants of those islands.

The war with Spain was speedily brought to an end. We speedily triumphed, and immediately following we sent our delegates to Paris, there to negotiate a treaty with Spain. We sent five of them. Among them was Mr. Whitelaw Reid. I imagine that the New York Tribune to-day inherits the views of Whitelaw Reid, the views he uttered there in Paris, for he believed in annexing and holding those islands apparently for all time.

The treaty was negotiated. It was brought finally here into this body. It provoked earnest, thoughtful, scholarly debate. There were those who favored it in the form in which it was presented. There were those who earnestly opposed it. But finally, Mr. President, it was ratified by the Senate of the United States. The war I spoke of was in 1898, as we all remember, and this treaty of ours was speedily negotiated and speedily brought to this body, and on February 6, 1899, the Senate ratified that treaty. That treaty ceded sovereignty over the Philippine Islands to the United States.

I digress to say that it appears to me, Mr. President, that there are those who have written about this bill and some who have talked about it who have never read it, as perhaps there are those who have never read the treaty with Spain of February 6, 1899. But whether that be so or not, that treaty ceded sovereignty to us; and the people of those islands believed, as millions of our people believed, as I believed, that we had taken over sovereignty with the then present intention of speedily transferring that sovereignty to the people of the islands, who as of the very time of our war with Spain were fighting and dying for their independence.

However, there is another matter often alluded to which I wish to put into the RECORD of this day's proceedings for the sake of those who favor this bill and in my own behalf. On the very day that the treaty with Spain was ratified, February 6, 1899, the Senate of the United States took up for consideration a resolution submitted by Senator McEnery, which resolution was in these words:

Resolved, etc., That by the ratification—

Note this language:

That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.

It is often said, Mr. President, that we made that declaration, but not every newspaper—very few, indeed—and not every speaker—none, so far as I recall—printed that formal resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States on the very day the Senate ratified the treaty with Spain.

Let it be remembered that the day we ratified the treaty whereby Spain ceded sovereignty over those islands to the United States, the Senate of the United States, after debate by learned, scholarly, and patriotic Senators, adopted that resolution offered by Senator McEnery. Not to paraphrase it, but to emphasize it, it was a declaration that we did not take over sovereignty in those islands for permanent holding, but, affirmatively, we said that it was but for temporary purposes; and the American people, certainly the Filipino people, believed and had abundant reason to believe that we would speedily carry out our avowed purposes and transfer to the inhabitants of the islands the sovereignty ceded to us by Spain.

Then came the unhappy, the unnecessary insurrection, causing the death of American citizens, causing death to many Filipinos, costing us probably \$200,000,000, causing two or three years of bloody strife, in order that we might bring about the "pacification" of those islands.

If we had then affirmatively and speedily carried out our expressed purpose, and had done for the Philippine Islands what we did for Cuba, there would have been no insurrection. Whilst I could cite here opinions of dozens of men then familiar with conditions in Cuba and in the Philippines, I content myself by referring to the utterance of Admiral Dewey, who said that the Filipino people were more competent for self-government than were the Cubans, "and," he added, "I know them both." They were capable of self-government then as they are now.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably I was out of the Chamber and the Senator may have answered the question I am going to propound. What was the date on which the joint resolution which he has quoted became effective?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It was February 6, 1899.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the date on which it passed the Senate?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. NORRIS. But, of course, it required the concurrence of the other House and the signature of the President to make it a law.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It did not go farther than the Senate. It went to the other House, but never passed that body. So the RECORD of this day's proceedings will contain the resolution passed by the Senate on the day the Senate ratified the treaty with Spain.

I wish to put into the RECORD another formal declaration, promise, plighted word, not only of the Senate but of the House of Representatives and of the then President of the United States in respect of our sovereignty over the Philippine people. I refer, of course, Mr. President, to the so-called Jones Act, the author of which now sleeps in an honored grave. I wish to read it for the benefit of those who hear and have it in the RECORD for the benefit of those who are disposed to read the RECORD.

We have heard much about the Jones bill, as we have heard much about this declaration of the Senate, but the Jones bill was an act—

to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

There is a preamble to the affirmative legislative provisions of the act, but for present purposes it is of the same weight and validity as if it were otherwise stated in the bill. The preamble, if we may so term it, reads as follows:

Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield to me for that purpose, not to affect his having the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on this bill tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas will disapprove what I am trying to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest the Senator make it 12 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I shall object to that, but I renew my request that we may vote not later than 12.30 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. TYDINGS. Make it 1 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Well, 1 o'clock. I will make that request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think 1 o'clock will be an acceptable time.

Mr. LONG. I make that request.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will that require the roll to be called to ascertain the presence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that it will require a roll call.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to make a suggestion about the request, if the Senator from California will permit me to do so in his time.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] is one of the authors of this proposed legislation. On account of conditions in the Senate, he has been unable to address the Senate on the subject. I think he ought to be allowed in all fairness to speak to the Senate without limitation. We all know the Senator from New Mexico will not unnecessarily take up the time of the Senate. I was ill when this bill was passed by the Senate, and I myself should like to have a few minutes to discuss it. I understand the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] wants to speak very briefly. I have no objection, Mr. President, if the request will be submitted that, after the Senator from New Mexico finishes his remarks, no Senator shall speak longer than 30 minutes—and I might make it 20 minutes, so far as I am concerned—nor more than once upon the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether he knows that to be acceptable to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not, although the Senator from Idaho told me he did not have a long speech, but wanted to speak on some of the questions involved.

If we limit the time to vote to a certain time, there is not any assurance given that those of us who feel that we ought to be allowed briefly to express our opinions on this legislation will be heard. Moreover, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], one of the best posted men on this question in the Senate, and who has given a great deal of study and attention to it, ought in all courtesy, it seems to me, to be allowed to make his remarks without any limitation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not the floor.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. All that the Senator from Nebraska has said is true. I am going to be entirely frank with the Senate. The votes are here now to override this veto. They have been here ever since the veto message came in. I do not know whether they can be marshaled on a subsequent occasion or not. For that reason I should prefer to vote to-day.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to voting to-day. I do not care, if the Senator wants to stay here, and the rest of the Senate want to stay.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I desire to add that I shall not long detain the Senate if there is any hope of voting to-day.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] has the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. In view of what the Senator from Nebraska has said, there being but three Senators to speak following the Senator from California, why is it not possible to let the debate take its natural course and come to a vote to-day?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what did the Senator say he wanted to have done to-day?

Mr. MOSES. I suggest to the Senate, and specifically to the Senator from Louisiana, inasmuch as there are only three Senators who have been named as wishing to speak following the speech of the Senator from California, that we should let the debate take its natural course and come to a vote some time at the session to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I should not wish to interfere with any right of the Senator from New Mexico to discuss this bill. If he should desire, if it should suit his convenience, to prolong the debate over the day, I should like to accede to his request; but it does seem to me that we might finish it to-night, unless the Senator from New Mexico prefers to have it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUTTING. In view of what the Senator from Arkansas has said, I have no desire to hold up a vote on this measure. I should be very glad to forego any remarks that I have to make, which in any case, I hope, will be sufficiently brief. If there is any chance of getting a vote to-night, I think we ought to go ahead and get the vote to-night. If there is not, then I do not believe there will be sufficient time between 12 and 2 to-morrow to take care of the Senators who probably will want to speak by that time.

Every Senator knows that when we go over a day a great many new things happen, and a great many Senators have remarks to make that they did not think that they were going to make the day before. Therefore I am disposed to object to the unanimous-consent request; but if there is any chance of going ahead to-night I agree with what the Senator from Arkansas has said, that we should go ahead.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Word has been passed out on both sides of the Chamber that the vote probably will come this evening, and the Senators are here. I think we ought to vote, in view of the statement just made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do, though I wish to conclude my remarks.

Mr. LONG. I just want to state, that being true, that I had understood that one or two of our Senators had planned to leave this evening. They had better stay here if we are going to vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. We are here.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, in view of what has just been said, and the hope expressed, it is perfectly manifest that I should curtail my remarks. I wish it understood, however, for my own sake, that I thought and I think that it was a wise policy expressed by the resolution of Senator McEnery, which I have read, and that it was a wise policy expressed in the preamble to the Jones Act, passed in 1916.

I must do myself the pleasure, however, of reading to the Senate, in the hope that the people of this Nation will hear, something that was said by a great, valiant, liberty-loving, American-loving President, Theodore Roosevelt.

What did that great man say concerning this immediate matter? He said this:

The only good that has come to us as a nation has been the good that springs from knowledge that a great deed has been worthily performed. Personally I think it is a fine and high thing for a nation to have done such a deed with such a purpose. But we can not taint it with bad faith.

Listen to those words:

We can not taint it with bad faith. If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines, from a military standpoint, are a source of weakness to us.

I pause to say that I wish that some of our now great military men, our Secretary of War, would hearken back to what Theodore Roosevelt thought touching military strength—that the Philippines were an element of weakness to us:

The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go, and by its actions has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any guarantee whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

There is a sermon; there is Americanism; and there is true American policy, which, among other things, means the good faith of this Nation. And I agree with Theodore Roosevelt.

Let me read to you what another scholarly and liberty-loving American President said. What did Woodrow Wilson say on this immediate subject?

President Wilson, among many other things, said this:

We regard ourselves as trustees acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence.

And now I quote a little further:

By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as the precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of these islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.

May I quote the language of the calm, yet far-seeing President lately gone to rest, Calvin Coolidge?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, from what is the Senator reading? I should have known, but I was called from the Chamber for a moment.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am reading now, immediately, the utterance of former President Coolidge. I have read from other Presidents:

It is not possible to believe that the American people would wish to continue their responsibility in regard to the sovereignty and administration of the islands. It is not conceivable that they would desire, merely because they possess the power, to continue exercising any measure of authority over a people who could better govern themselves on a basis of complete independence.

Reference was made earlier in the day to the fact that great political parties had expressed the same views. Harking back to our taking over the sovereignty of Spain to be held temporarily, and referring to our express promise then made to convey that sovereignty to the inhabitants, I am standing here to-day—embarrassed, indeed, by the condition which the debate has gotten into—to ask the Senate whether or no we, the United States of America, are going to keep our voluntarily pledged word; whether we are going to put upon America a crown of glory or one of shame and repudiation?

The declaration of the Senate, the declarations of the Congress in the Jones Act, the views expressed by Presidents, the matured, deliberate views put into the platforms of great national, patriotic, political parties, were the expression of a wise and just policy. That policy not only affected the rights of 13,000,000 people, it not only affected our own rights in a commercial way, but, for reasons which I could elaborate and defend historically and logically, that policy was wise as it affected and affects our foreign policy. Here in the Senate on other occasions, and elsewhere on many occasions, I have called attention to the fact that away back yonder, in 1793, Washington warned America to keep out of Europe, and we have wisely heeded his advice; that in 1823 James Monroe warned Europe to keep out of America, and Europe has heeded that warning. In effect, our views concerning the Philippines were a warning to America to keep out of the Orient. What Washington said, what Monroe said, what these great former Presidents said, will not be forgotten. What I say may be forgotten within the hour of utterance. But I do here this day warn America to keep out of the Orient, to get out of the Orient, and to stay out of the Orient.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wanted to hear the Senator answer, if he would, as to what he thinks the Monroe doctrine has to do with our getting out of the Orient.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If the Senator did me the credit to note what I was saying, he would have heard me say that even as Washington had warned us to keep out of Europe, as Monroe had warned Europe to keep out of America, I and others would warn America to keep out of the Orient, for if we stay there we assuredly will be drawn into great, serious trouble. I want the United States to come home, to build up this Continent, to develop America, and let the Orient take care of itself.

I am not unmindful, of course, of the fact that we have commercial interests involved. But I want America to keep out of the Orient. Why? We are not an empire. We are not a colony-building people. Our form of government is not framed or fashioned on imperialistic lines. We are a democracy; we are a nation of 48 quasi-sovereign States. We have one Constitution. We do not want to make a State of the Philippines. We do not want to hold them as a colony, and we ought not to hold them in subjection, against their prayers and their tears. In recollection of their 3-century struggle for the independence for which our forefathers laid down their lives we should set them free.

The heart swells, the tears almost come to the eye, when we think of our own 3,500,000 people fighting the British Empire. For what? Trade? No; for liberty. Now think

of those far-away Filipino people struggling for centuries for the same precious jewel of independence and liberty. And shall we in America, we, the champion of freedom, we, whose flag is said to be the oriflamme of liberty enlightening the world, we, who have prided ourselves as standing as an exemplar for the world—shall we be put in the attitude of holding a people in subjection who are quite capable of self-government, and to whom we have promised independence? Wherefore I ask, when are we going to keep our promise? When are we going to keep faith with the Filipinos, when are we going to keep faith with ourselves?

I say, Mr. President, that—

Good name in man and woman, * * *
Is the immediate jewel of their souls:
Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him
And makes me poor indeed.

What is true of man and woman is equally true of a nation. A nation can forfeit its good reputation. A nation can scandalize itself. A nation, by the breaking of its word, its solemn promise, can make itself dishonored.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has been speaking with great eloquence of responsive American action in respect to the wishes of the native Filipino people. Would it alter his view respecting the pending measure if the official spokesperson for the Filipino people should brand the pending measure as an utterly inadequate and unacceptable answer to these promises to which the Senator adverts?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Assuming that this measure should be so characterized, it would not change my view that our duty is to go forward.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not finding myself in controversy with the Senator upon that score, because I agree with him. The sole question I am submitting to the Senator is whether or not the pending measure is an answer to this obligation. May I ask the Senator, with his permission, whether he has seen an Associated Press dispatch in the Evening Star to-day, from which I shall read but two sentences, so as not to trespass upon the Senator's good nature.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Before the Senator reads that let me say that I do not know who inspired it, and I am not taking it as authoritative. However, the Senator may read it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am reading what purports to be a statement of fact, and not opinion. At any rate, it is upon the responsibility of the Associated Press, which is not ordinarily caught off base.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is dated at Manila, in the Philippine Islands:

Members of the insular house decided in caucus to-day that they would not accept the Philippine independence bill even if it passed over President Hoover's veto by the United States Senate. The insular senate is expected to take similar action.

If that be true, may I inquire of the Senator whether he would think that we had answered the responsibility to which he adverts, if we persisted in the pending legislation?

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, the bill now before us provides that the legislature of the Philippine Islands shall decide the question of independence. Now, at the eleventh hour, with the Philippine mission in Washington, composed of the speaker of the house, the floor leader of the majority and the floor leader of the minority in the house, and the same representation from the senate, are we to be dissuaded by a news item from Manila, where there is a little group of Americans left, where there were 12,000 and are only 6,000 now, that a debate in the Senate should be inter-

rupted when the official spokesmen selected by the people are here, and have told the President of the United States, and have told each Senator by a communication to-day, that the Filipino people are united?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to make this suggestion, if the Senator will permit me, as to the Associated Press dispatch which has just been published. Under the bill before us the Filipinos will be allowed to vote on this matter. We ought to do what is our duty. Then let the Filipinos do what they have the right to do under the bill, express their sentiments at the polls, and we will take the consequences.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Michigan, I stated at the outset that this bill was in the nature of a compromise, the result of the yielding of divergent views, but that after study and discussion it came before us in the form in which we find it.

I intended to say, in substance, what the Senator from Tennessee has just said, namely, I am concerned with our duty, and if this bill becomes a law it will be up to the Filipino people to act as they deem wise.

I question the validity of the telegram. I do not know who inspired it. I have a certain respect for the Associated Press. I have some telegrams here which, following the example of my friend from Michigan, I may read, to quiet the fears of our Secretary of War, who seems to think that the moment the bill before us shall become law, Japan will sail to the Philippines and annex or absorb them. Of course, Japan will do nothing of the sort, now or hereafter.

To resume, our foreign policy, to which I have alluded, I think has been wise, and if we have had a foreign policy in respect to Europe, if we have had a foreign policy as to Europe's interfering with small struggling nations in this hemisphere, I have said, and repeat, that I would have America come home and remain out of the Orient—not overlooking the welfare of the Philippine people.

Mr. President, there was one thing in the message of the President which I very heartily approve. He spoke about the exclusion of the Filipinos from continental United States. Years ago I introduced into this body a bill proposing to stop the coming hither of Filipino laborers. Such a bill is now pending in a committee of the Senate.

When the Harris immigration bill was before us, I offered an amendment to exclude Filipino labor. I had intended to devote some little time to that point, but for manifest reasons I merely allude to it to add this. When I introduced the bill to exclude Filipino laborers from the United States, I received from practically every labor union in the State of California, from practically every public-spirited man in that State, telegrams and letters approving that measure.

From the president of the American Federation of Labor, from chambers of commerce, from societies, and from groups of citizens, letters and telegrams came to me approving the measure. My bill would exclude Filipino laborers from continental United States. It does not affect the Hawaiian Islands. I was not immediately concerned with them, and their seasonal labor condition seemed to need additional help.

I heartily approve what the President has said in his message, now before us, in respect to Filipino immigration; I now content myself by saying that I think we have the constitutional power and the constitutional right to pass such a bill. And with great respect for my friend from Missouri, and for others, including the Senator from Connecticut, I assert that to pass a measure to exclude Filipino labor from the United States would be neither unconstitutional nor immoral nor violative of any just principle of our Government; and I hope that ultimately such a bill may be enacted. But the bill before us achieves practically that result, due largely to my colleague, who introduced and pressed our view upon the Senate. It limits migration or immigration to the United States in such manner as to relieve us in great measure from the fears we of the Pacific coast have had and have in regard to this labor problem.

But may I add that because of conditions of unemployment in the United States to-day—for every reason, but for that reason particularly—we do not need additional labor coming from the Orient, from the Philippines, or other oriental countries. It was California that led the battle for the exclusion of Chinese. It was largely due to California that the battle to exclude Japanese was fought—not that we hated China, not that we hated Japan. America hates no nation. We hate no people. But our first regard was, and is, for our own people; wherefore the law which excludes all races that are ineligible to citizenship in the United States. For economic reasons, for racial reasons, we exclude them, and I would have the Filipinos excluded, certainly not because we hate them, for it may be said that we love them, but for our sake and, as I have heretofore pointed out on this floor, for their own sake. For it would be far better for them to remain at home and develop their own country. I say that to the Filipino commissioners who have been here. I have been to some extent misrepresented in that I was opposing the coming of Filipinos to the United States. Whenever I uttered that thought, I followed it by saying that I was in favor of granting them independence, and the sooner the better.

Mr. President, the bill provides in effect that in some 10 years from now complete independence shall be accorded to the Filipino people. It struck me as a very happy thought of those who framed the bill, the precedent conditions having been complied with that the proclamation declaring their independence should be put forth on the 4th day of July, the one great bright day in the lexicon of liberty. Ten years will be afforded for commercial interests to adjust themselves. We gave Spain 10 years after the treaty to adjust her commercial trade relations with the islands. We give American capital or other capital full 10 years to adjust itself before full independence is granted to the Philippine Islands. Then of course, being an independent nation, if we enact tariff laws, tariff duties will be levied and collected on Filipino imports as will be levied and collected on like articles imported from other foreign countries. The Filipino will be treated justly and fairly, as we hope we shall treat other nations justly and fairly.

In a word, the bill gives 10 years for commerce to adjust itself in anticipation of independence and in anticipation of tariff laws affecting the trade between those islands and the United States. Of course, I need not say that I am a thorough 100 per cent protective-tariff man. I believe in that doctrine as Washington did and as a great many now believe who six months ago were inveighing against the Smoot-Hawley bill. I am a protective-tariff man. I believe in that doctrine. I believe in the American producer having primarily the American market. I know that we can not compete even in our own markets with the products of cheap labor of the Orient or of many of the European countries, and the only way by which we can preserve the American market for the American producer is by way of the tariff, perhaps in some instances being justified in having an embargo upon imports.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I want to ask the Senator what is the difference between our advocating a tariff and this so-called "buy American" movement? Is there any difference between what we have been standing for and the new name that is given the tariff?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I quite agree with the thought of the Senator. My distinguished fellow citizen of California, in now advancing the "buy American" principle, is really bringing to bear a practical application of a wise protective tariff policy. I congratulate him and am very happy and gratified that my personal acquaintance and friend, Mr. Hearst, has now taken the position openly, bravely, which I feebly have been supporting for half a century.

I know, for example—just to turn aside for the moment—as my colleague and as well-informed Senators know, California in many of her products can not compete with like products coming from many cheap-labor countries. I know, further, that with the depreciated currencies of the world our present tariff laws are inadequate to guard the American market for the American producer. The "buy American" proposition is in its essence a tariff proposition, and I go further and say that those who were attacking the tariff law, and particularly the section which gives the Tariff Commission, with the approval of the President, the power to raise or to lower 50 per cent a given rate, ought now to welcome that power; for, if I had the President's power, I would call upon the Tariff Commission to increase practically every rate in the existing law the full limit of 50 per cent.

A few weeks ago those interested in imports from China sought to reduce the tariff on poultry products, for example. I was, of course, gratified that the Tariff Commission refused to reduce them and that the President promptly approved the action of the Tariff Commission. Whilst digressing somewhat from the line of my thought, I perhaps repeat myself when I say that the present tariff rates on practically every product of the farm, practically every product of the shop, practically every product of the mines of America, are inadequate to protect as against imports of like products.

I also digress further to say that what Hancock said has somehow come to be quite generally believed, for when the proposition to put copper on the protected list was presented, the learned and scholarly Senators from Montana voted for it; similarly as to oil and coal and lumber, and similarly as to many other products from individual States, many distinguished Democratic Members voted for tariff protection. But I am an American protective-tariff man, and I would protect the products of Maine as quickly as I would one of California. I would go to the State of Alabama and protect her industries as cheerfully as I would one of my own beloved State of California. I am not a State man. I do not claim to be a statesman, but I am not a State man. I am an American and believe in developing the resources of every State in the Union; hence my protective-tariff philosophy.

A moment more, Mr. President, and I shall not further trespass upon the attention of the Senate. I said that I am not indifferent to commercial interests, to trade relationships, between us and the Philippines or between us and any other country. But, sir, there are some things more precious, more to be desired, than trade or commerce; and among those more to be desired and precious things is liberty, the independence of a separate people. Even as our forefathers fought for independence, so the people of the Philippine Islands have fought and are praying for independence. It is for us to grant it to them.

When I listened to the masterly address of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the scholarly remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], the splendid argumentative statements of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], and the authoritative words of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], I bethought myself that it would not be at all necessary or proper for me to add a word; certainly it would not be necessary. But having walked under the Republican banner all my life and being one of that faith and that designation, and a Republican President having sent this veto message here, upon reflection I felt it proper, if not necessary, for me in a general way to explain why I could not follow him.

I can not and I shall not. I respect the views of others. I have never on the floor of the Senate questioned the integrity or imputed to any Senator an unworthy or unpatriotic motive, and I shall retire from the Senate with the conscious pride of according to every Member of this body a desire to advance the material interests of his country as well as its reputation. Nothing I say to-day should be considered as a reflection upon the good intentions of any who may differ from me. But I must insist that the

good name of America be preserved, that the reputation of the United States shall not be tainted, shall not be sullied. I must insist that the plighted word of America, the voluntary promise of America, shall be kept.

When are we to grant independence to the Philippine people? We said in effect we would do so when they had established a stable government, when they had revealed capacity for self-government. Have they not met those precedent conditions, to use the phrase of President Wilson? With the utmost respect for Central and South American States, with the utmost respect for certain European nations, I venture this day to say that the Filipino people have now and will continue to have when they are in full control as stable a government as exists in many of the nations referred to.

In any event, Mr. President, I want America to come home; I want the United States to come out of the Orient. We are not an empire. Our fathers did not design that we should become a colony-owning form of government. Therefore, I feel that I am standing for this country, its best interests, and its honor when I insist that the promise of America shall be fulfilled. How can we fulfill it otherwise than by the passage of this bill? Some thoughtful Senator may say that if this bill shall not become a law a much better one will be passed. However, let us not deceive ourselves. There are men in this Nation to-day who, for financial or other reasons, wish us to continue forever in possession of the Philippine Islands. Just as when Patrick Henry thundered yonder in Virginia there were gentlemen who wanted to continue to be British subjects, so there are those to-day who want us to continue to control the Philippine Islands indefinitely. I am opposed to that policy. I want to come home; I want to be at peace with the world, and we shall escape danger by coming home.

When the Philippine Islands become independent, what then? Mr. President, this bill calls for a treaty, the foreign powers guaranteeing neutrality of the Philippine Islands, in effect guaranteeing the independence of those islands. It will be to the interest of Japan and of China and of other countries interested to join with us in such a treaty.

I have no fear of Japan—none whatever—and while what I think may be of no moment to Japan or any other country, I see no reason why Japan should not set up or assist in setting up a stable government in Manchuria.

There are gentlemen here in Washington who seem to fear that the moment we withdraw from the Philippines Japan will absorb them. I do not join in that fear. Japan will recognize the independence of those islands, as will other nations, the moment, when on the 4th of July some 10 or 12 years from now, the proclamation shall be issued by the President of the United States declaring their complete independence. I hope that day will come; and if all other votes I have cast in this body shall be forgotten, if all other words I have uttered shall perish, I want it to be remembered that this day I stood up and spoke and voted for what I conceived to be the material welfare and the honor of the Nation. We should keep faith with the Philippines and with ourselves. Let us be true to our own traditions. Let us not give the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope. Let us be just and fear not. Let us not miss this opportunity to enlarge the boundaries of freedom. Let us do for the Philippines what we did for Cuba—set them free.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think I have a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to which, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is willing, we may all agree. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that a vote be taken on the pending bill at 2 o'clock to-morrow, with the understanding that, with the exception of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], speeches shall be limited to 30 minutes. I think we can get such an agreement.

Mr. McNARY. I should not consent to the proposal in the absence of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas entered the Chamber.

Mr. LONG. My request, after consulting with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], is that we meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock and vote on the pending bill at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG. All right, Mr. President; I am going to make another speech on this bill to-night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas objects to the request for unanimous consent preferred by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CUTTING obtained the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dale	Kendrick	Sheppard
Austin	Davis	Keyes	Shipstead
Bailey	Dickinson	King	Shortridge
Bankhead	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Barbour	Fess	Lewis	Smoot
Barkley	Fletcher	Logan	Steiwer
Bingham	Frazier	Long	Stephens
Black	George	McGill	Swanson
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Glenn	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Townsend
Brookhart	Gore	Moses	Trammell
Broussard	Grammer	Neely	Tydings
Bulkley	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Bulow	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Walcott
Capper	Hatfield	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hawes	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Hebert	Reynolds	Wheeler
Copeland	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	White
Costigan	Hull	Robinson, Ind.	
Couzens	Johnson	Russell	
Cutting	Kean	Schuyler	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] has the floor.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, for the first time in history, so far as I know, a great nation, of its own volition, is proposing to give freedom to a people whose domain has formed an integral part of its territory. For the first time in history, so far as I know, a people numbering 13,000,000 is acquiring liberty, not through physical violence and bloodshed but by the vote of the legislature of the controlling power in harmony with the desires of the people who have been subordinate. I think, Mr. President, that ought to be a source of pride to both peoples, to our people, who are willing to part with our sovereignty, no less than to the people of the Philippine Islands who have so ably demonstrated their capacity for self-government.

This action may well form an important landmark in world history; now, at the last moment, we ought not to be diverted from our purpose by any grounds other than those of compelling necessity.

It had not been my intention to address myself to the veto message of the President. That message, in my opinion, was most ably answered on Saturday by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. If I may digress for a moment, I should like to pay a tribute to the chairman of the committee. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] started out some three years ago with his mind almost made up against Philippine independence. Throughout the hearings he showed his good faith by a gradual modification of his views by joining the other members of the committee in an attempt to solve as well as possible the enormous difficulties which lay in the path of any bill of this kind, by compromising his own personal views in order to obtain a proper measure, and by fighting for that measure after it had been agreed to in the committee.

We all know that the senior Senator from Connecticut is a conservative Member of this body. He has proven, by his

actions in support of this bill, that he is a man not only of scholarship but of sufficient intellectual integrity to refuse to allow his position to be stultified by any authority, even though it be the authority of the President of the United States, who belongs to his own party.

I honor the Senator for his attitude on Saturday. I honor the Senator for his remarks. I should add nothing to them except for the fact that, unfortunately, when the Senator from Connecticut made his speech on Saturday, he did not have before him the four letters by members of the Cabinet on which the President's action apparently was based.

The hour is late. I do not wish unduly to fatigue the Members of the Senate; but I think that on a question of this gravity we should pay some attention to the attempt to enlist four members of the Cabinet in public support of the President's views.

These four letters were sent to the President before he published his veto message. They might have been sent to the Senate together with that message. Why was that not done? Why, at this late hour, should the President attempt to bolster up his cause by bringing in these statements by four Cabinet members, who, as I shall attempt in a moment to show, are completely in opposition to each other, and, in some respects, to themselves?

I suspect, Mr. President, that when the Senator from Connecticut on Saturday, on the floor of this Chamber, accused the President of inaccuracy the President attempted to strengthen his own cause by adducing the evidence of the members of his own Cabinet; and in that connection I should like, as briefly as possible, to call the attention of Members of the Senate to the utterly diverse stands taken by these four members of the President's Cabinet.

Let us begin with Secretary Hyde.

The objection of Secretary Hyde to this bill is that in the matter of curtailment of Philippine imports into this country the bill is entirely too liberal; that it will afford no sufficient protection to the agricultural interests of this country.

Let me read a few sentences which will illustrate his point of view:

During the first period—

Says Secretary Hyde—

that is, until establishment of the intermediate government, no protection whatever is afforded to American agriculture.

In the third period—

By which the Secretary means the period during which the export duties are imposed—

there is no real protection afforded to American farmers by the export taxes. Even the maximum—25 per cent of the existing duties—would afford American competitive products no adequate protection.

The position of Secretary Hyde seems to me fairly plain.

Let us turn to the views of Secretary Chapin.

The Secretary of Commerce on January 9 wrote a letter which contains the following:

Economic stability of the Philippines and their ability to import from abroad mainly depend upon the exportation of the principal Philippine agricultural products—sugar, hemp, coconut, and tobacco products, and also embroideries, which recently have attained considerable importance.

The Secretary of Commerce goes on to show that the main difficulty in any bill of this sort is with regard to the sugar crop, and he elaborates that as follows:

The sugar industry, with an investment of approximately \$200,000,000, accounted in 1931 for 48 per cent of the total returns from Philippine exports. Philippine sugar so far has not been able to compete effectively in world markets with either Cuban or Javan sugars and is therefore sold entirely in the United States. From a study of comparative production costs it is clear that it could not be sold in the American market even if admitted under the reduced rate on Cuban sugar, and, considering the present overproduction, no other market is available.

The Secretary goes on to show the way in which sugar production is inextricably involved with other Philippine industries.

The Philippine National Bank—

He says—

has approximately \$13,000,000, or 55 per cent of its total investment, in loans and advances directly dependent upon the sugar industry for liquidation. Disruption of this industry would seriously affect at least two-thirds of the value of those loans, or more than the combined capital stock and surplus of the bank.

The Secretary goes on to point out:

During the past eight or nine years the two railway systems of the Philippines have received the bulk of their freight revenue from sugar, which has not only accounted for the increases in total freight receipts but has actually absorbed the substantial losses in revenues derived from the transportation of other freight. Loss of the sugar traffic not only would be a heavy blow to the railroads but it would entail further losses from the great reduction in merchandise which is now carried to the sugar provinces.

So, Mr. President, we have the Secretary of Agriculture insisting that a far greater curtailment of Philippine imports must be put into effect or American agriculture will suffer; and, on the other hand, we have the Secretary of Commerce stating that the curtailment which is contained in the present bill will be so extraordinary and so severe that the Philippines could not possibly live under such a curtailment.

I submit to the Senate that no possible bill, involving the Philippine independence, would correspond both with the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and with the views of the Secretary of Commerce. I shall not elaborate the point at the present time, except to point out a minor discrepancy, but the kind of discrepancy which vitiates the President's message as a whole—that the figures used by the Secretary of Commerce are the figures for the year 1930, and that the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture are the figures for the year 1928.

Now, Mr. President, let me call attention to the letter from the Secretary of State.

Secretary Stimson shows himself, as we have always known him, an honorable and straightforward man. He is an imperialist. He says so in as clear language as any human being can state it:

Any withdrawal of American sovereignty from the islands, even the best and most carefully devised conditions, and with the utmost and continuous good-will on the part of both of the Governments concerned, will necessarily be attended by hazard and uncertainty and will involve risk to the welfare of the Filipinos, on one side, and to the prestige and future interests of the United States on the other.

He says, later:

No one can live with the Filipinos and not realize that their desire for what they call independence is fundamentally a desire for a fuller measure of domestic self-government and not a desire to cast off the protection and advantages of their connection with the United States. No one with such an experience can fail to anticipate that after the vote for the new constitution has been taken and after, through the subsequent provisions of the bill, the Filipinos have come to suffer from the economic consequences of the 10-year period of ostensible probation which the bill sets up, and after they then find that they have bound themselves irrevocably to a loss of the economic advantages which they previously enjoyed, they will be quick to charge that they have been the victims of a shabby trick at the hands of the Government which has assumed to be their guardian and their benefactor.

In other words, Mr. Stimson is confident that he knows the desire of the Philippine people better than the official representatives whom they have sent to Washington in their behalf.

I shall make only one further quotation from the Secretary of State. He argues for—

a constructive solution of the Philippine problem which would preserve for future generations of Americans and Filipinos the benefit of this remarkable and successful experiment in cooperation between these two peoples.

It is clear, not only from these passages but from the whole of Secretary Stimson's letter, that no bill granting independence to the Philippine Islands could meet with his approval. He is against independence at any time and under any conditions, and he is candid enough to say so.

As against that position of the Secretary of State, let me for a moment revert to the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, who says:

It seems clear to me that the American farmer is being misled as to the protection offered by this bill. It is now that he needs

protection, not several years hence when the country has generally recovered.

In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture desires immediate independence, and the Secretary of State desires independence at no time whatever.

I should perhaps apologize for taking any of the time of the Senate in discussing the letter from the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War appeared before the committee, suggested no practical substitute for the measure which we have before us, gave testimony which seemed on its face to be self-contradictory, and now presents a letter which is obviously self-contradictory. It is a very long letter, and I shall call attention to only one or two sentences in it.

Under part 1 the Secretary states:

The United States has a moral commitment before the world to give the Philippine Islands independence when the Filipino people are prepared for it and if they then desire it. The United States, of course, has the right to give the Philippines independence when they are prepared for it, whether they request it or not.

A great many people have criticized the bill because it was subject to so many different plebiscites or votes on the part of the Philippine Legislature and the Philippine people, but so far as I know this is the first time anyone has criticized the bill because we let the Philippine people have anything to say about it at all. Yet that is the only conclusion we can draw from that passage in the letter from the Secretary of War.

The Secretary criticizes section 10, which deals with the establishment of independence of the Philippine Islands during the eleventh year after the inauguration of the commonwealth government, and this is what he says:

It is considered both inexpedient and hazardous to anticipate future developments by adopting an arbitrary time-table or by specifying a definite date for ultimate independence. Qualification for independence is a condition to be achieved gradually as a result of trial and error and progressive adjustment. To say now that the Philippine Islands will be prepared for independence in a particular future year and that world conditions will then be propitious is as impossible as it is unwise.

In other words, as opposed to the position of the Secretary of State that the Philippine Islands should never have independence, and as opposed to the position of the Secretary of Agriculture that they should be allowed to go at once, the Secretary of War takes the position that we have a moral commitment to give them independence, but that we should not name a definite date because that would be inexpedient and hazardous, and that we must allow the future, which we can not foresee, to take care of itself, because possibly at some date conditions may be such that he would agree that independence might be feasible. Yet in part 3 the Secretary goes on to say:

In my annual report to you, and elsewhere, I have raised a question regarding the constitutionality of an act of Congress purporting to alienate the sovereignty of the United States over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands. It is incumbent upon me, as an official, to raise that question again. I am not convinced that the Congress and the President are without power to dispose of the Philippine Islands.

In other words, after saying that there may be some indefinite date in the future at which the Philippine Islands would be ready for independence, the Secretary apparently takes the position that there are constitutional objections which would prevent us granting them their independence at any time.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, at which time the consideration of the President's veto message on the Philippine bill shall be resumed for discussion, and that no Senator shall be permitted to speak more than once or more than 30 minutes until the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. BORAH. That is a little unfair to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CUTTING. I do not consider it so.

Mr. WATSON. I would not want to suggest anything that would be unfair to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, it is not intended, but I suspect that if such an agreement should go into effect, and the Senator from New Mexico should proceed with his speech, a number of Senators would go to dinner.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, before I consent to the unanimous-consent request, I want to suggest that if the idea is that we shall take a recess immediately after the Senator from New Mexico shall conclude, we should take the recess now, and let him conclude to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is the only fair thing to be done for the Senator from New Mexico, I think.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator from California will permit, I intended to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that that would be entirely proper, provided he could complete his address in 30 minutes to-morrow.

Mr. CUTTING. I think I can do so, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think we should take a recess now until 11 o'clock, and that the limitation on debate should not go into effect until the Senator from New Mexico shall have concluded his remarks.

Mr. WATSON. That is all right. I modify my request as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modified request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered (by unanimous consent). That the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow and that after the conclusion of the address of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] no Senator may speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes upon the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

RECESS

In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 17, 1933, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the hour of weakness and temptation, when beaten and baffled; when we perceive how vast the universe is in which we move and our thoughts are filled with wonder and puzzle; in these experiences, to know that our names are written on Thy hands is the sweetest poetry of human life. O Thou who hast revealed Thyself as eternal righteousness and eternal love, let there be in our hearts the psalm of praise and gratitude. Almighty God, Thou art the inspiration of every great movement in all the earth; Thou dost bind age to age and art the very soul of history, move upon the face of all lands and bind us to all things that run toward eternal good and are celebrated in heaven. In the name of the world's Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 14, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5357. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13975) making